

313185

JPRS-UWE-84-010

1 October 1984

USSR Report

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No. 6, June 1984

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

19980318 113

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

4
118
A06

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

1 October 1984

USSR REPORT
WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No 6, June 1984

Except where indicated otherwise in the table of contents the following is a complete translation of the Russian-language monthly journal MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA published in Moscow by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences.

CONTENTS

English Summaries of Major Articles in MEMO Journal (pp 158-159).....	1
Editorial on CPSU Central Committee Plenum Economic, Political Activities (pp 3-14).....	5
Greater Western 'Politicizing' of Economic Theory Noted (pp 15-26) (A. Mileykovskiy).....	19
NATO, EEC Foreign Policy Role, Divergence From U.S. Policy (pp 27-38) (V. Baranovskiy).....	33
Social Disruption of Western Microelectronics Boom Examined (pp 39-52) (N. Ivanov).....	46
Scandinavia's 'Industrial Niche' Concept Examined (pp 53-65) (O. Kazakova) (not translated)	

CRITIQUE OF BOURGEOIS THEORIES

From Keynesianism to Monetarism in Britain (pp 66-78)
(Ye. Khesin, V. Studentsov) (not translated)

TRIBUNE OF THE ECONOMIST AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS EXPERT

International Monopolies at Times of Crises (pp 79-90)
(A. Yudanov) (not translated)

Prospects of the Use of Modern Technology in the Developing Countries
(pp 91-98)
(V. Gromeka, A. Dynkin) (not translated)

MEMO ROUNDTABLE

IMEMO Roundtable on Improving UN Peacekeeping Role (pp 99-131)..... 63

SURVEYS, INFORMATION

Interimperialist Rivalry in the Banking Sphere (pp 132-140)
(O. Shenayev) (not translated)

SCIENTIFIC LIFE

Soviet-French Symposium on Economic, Technical Cooperation (pp 141-142)
(A. Kudryavtsev)..... 93

BOOK, AUTHORS

Development of U.S. 'Philosophy of Strength' Reviewed (pp 143-145)
(V. Karpukhin, Ya. Povarkov)..... 97

N. Kuznetsov review of "Soviet Power and Western Negotiating Policies.
Volume I. The Soviet Asset: Military Power in the Competition Over
Europe. Edited by Uwe Nerlich (pp 145-147) (not translated)

Book on African Foreign Policy Edited By Anatoliy Gromyko (pp 148-149)
(V. Kasatkin)..... 101

Economic Structure of Imperialism, Monopolist Contradictions (pp 149-151)
(R. Entov)..... 104

I. Bushmarin review of "Unemployment--The Tragedy of Millions".
Edited by N.D. Gauzner (pp 151-153) (not translated)

Oriental Studies Institute Book on TNC's in Southeast Asia (pp 153-154)
(M. Zagrebel'nyy)..... 107

Japanese Book on Japan's Technical Innovations, Trade (pp 155-157)
(M. Vcherashnyaya) 110

Document Publication Announced (p 157)..... 113

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS No 6, June 1984

Russian title : MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE
OTNOSHENIYA

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : Ya.S. Khavinson

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "Pravda"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : June 1984

Signed to press : 17 May 1984

Copies : 29,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya
ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya".
1984.

ENGLISH SUMMARIES OF MAJOR ARTICLES IN 'MEMO' JOURNAL

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6,
Jun 84 pp 158-159

[Text] The article "Following the Communist Course of Creativity and Peace" is about the historic importance of the February and April 1984 Plenary Meetings of the CPSU Central Committee which put forward and concretized the vital tasks facing the USSR have demonstrated the continuity of the CPSU line in domestic and foreign policy with its wide-ranging programme for implementing the decisions taken by the 26th CPSU Congress, ensuring the country's economic and social progress. The article describes the initiatives put forward by the Plenary Meetings as a comprehensive task which embodies a wide spectrum of socio-political, economic and organizational measures. To fulfil this task it is necessary to link more closely the profound changes in the economy with perfection of planning and of the economic management mechanism. Only on the basis of steady and constructive development of the national economy, accelerated scientific and technical progress the transition of the economy to the road of intensive development and more rational utilization of the country's production potential is it possible to ensure what has been done and what has yet to be done in the political sphere where socialist democracy and the entire political system of society are being steadily improved. It also involves the social field underlying that there should be no room in the Soviet society for complacency and placidity. The most urgent task in the field of international relations is the solution of the top priority problems, facing mankind, aimed at reducing the danger of nuclear war and lessening international tension, at turning the present dangerous course of events towards consolidating peace, limiting and reducing the arms race and establishing mutually advantageous cooperation between countries with differing social systems.

The Communist Party of the CPSU focuses on two pivotal issues of the agenda; systematic construction of the developed socialist society in the USSR and strengthening of peace, saving of civilization from the menace a world war. This is the essence of the CPSU policy's long-term strategic course, formulated by the 26th CPSU Congress.

The article "Bourgeois Political Economy and Contemporary Problems of Economic Policy" by academician A. Mileykovskiy is based on his report, delivered at Sofia round table meeting in 1983 devoted to the examination of modern bourgeois economic postulates. This article throws light on issues of great importance: the evolution of bourgeois political economy in the context of the ideological struggle and the essential shifts in the economic policy of the

leading capitalist countries. This importance stems from the recent heightened concern of the growing politicization of economics, centering nowadays on the problems of the two social systems confrontation. The review of recent trends in bourgeois economic theory gives evidence to the mounting political goals over the criteria of economic efficiency. Here the author focuses on the so-called Reaganomics which concentrates the named trends. The author presents the scientifically substantiated analysis of the present militarization purported to bring about actually global military coalition of the imperialist states. This course is nothing but imperialist folly, leading the global civilization to the edge of catastrophe.

As far as the economic policy is concerned there is fierce struggle among various schools and specialists, arguing about the contemporary economic role of the bourgeois state, the balance between the free-market economy and margins of the state monopoly regulation. The combination of three crises: structural, cyclical along with the aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism revealed the helplessness of both Keynesian and Conservative prescriptions, aimed to treat inflation and unemployment and increasing deficits of governments' budgets. Economic and political programs of social-democratic parties though anti-imperialist in nature, providing for democratic plantification within the framework of the nationalized sector of the economy, adjoin the fact to the platform of bourgeois reformist doctrines.

V. Baranovskiy in the article "NATO and EEC in Imperialist Policy" examines the vital role NATO and EEC play in the foreign policy of the leading imperialist countries. The two bodies do their utmost to help the Western states coordinate their efforts on the world arena. The article points out that NATO's active military preparations and above all the deployment in Europe of American medium-range missiles result in an aggravation of tension the world over and destabilization of international and political development. At the same time the deepening of American-West European contradictions, the military security sphere included, becomes for NATO the "acid test" and will inevitably generate ever new problems for the bloc. The coordination of foreign policy by the EEC participants has of late acquired ever greater importance for the development of this organization. The foreign policy coordination mechanism which has been created within the framework of the common market increasingly influences certain aspects of present international development. Serving as the instruments of the foreign-political strategy of the developed capitalist countries, NATO and EEC perform peculiar functions as of the imperialist camp's champions and participate in a kind of "division of labor," supplementing each other in their international activities.

The 1970-1980 decade represents the beginning of a new state in the development of the scientific-technical revolution that of microelectronics. N. Ivanov in the article "Socioeconomic Consequences of Mass Utilization of Microelectronics" examines how computerization of the economics of the capitalist countries tells on employment and unemployment. The author shows that the automation gives rise to the situation when certain trouble switching from the old industries. The accelerating pace of technological innovation threatens jobs in these industries even if it creates working places in the new field of

microelectronic revolution. It affects the role of a man in capitalist society as computerization of economics in the conditions of low tempo of economic growth brings about a high level of unemployment. The rivalry of the markets is aggravated. The TNC's having monopolized the new high technology industries, force out their rivals from the markets and export unemployment to technically less developed countries. The management of the firms employ microelectronics to revive Taylorism on a high-technology base. The dehumanization of social life is over more acutely felt through computerization. The author states that microelectronics enlarges technical opportunities of control over private life and public opinion manipulation in the interests of monopolistic capital.

Small Scandinavian countries are highly subject to the negative shifts within the international capitalist division of labor, prove to be vulnerable to the destructive effects of the imperialist competition on world capitalist markets. O. Kazakova in the article "Scandinavian Concept of 'Industrial Niche'" highlights the main issues of Scandinavian and negative economic consequences, particulars of its implementation of Sweden, Denmark and Norway.

According to the author the "industrial niche" concept comprises such prime components as the emphasis on certain industrial branch production which can be hardly substituted for on world capitalist markets due to its high technological, economic and commercial performance. The choice of this certain industry or sector of production has to be preceeded by thorough assessment of the world demand on the appropriate goods and followed by permanent adjustment to the changes of this demand both in quality and quantity.

"Niche type" of international specialization represents the strategy of small capitalist countries challenging the corporations of the imperialist states based on advantages of highly specialized production being of less or no interest for leading monopolies. This strategy matches with relatively small size of companies in Scandinavian countries, providing for their flexible adjustment to changes of world demand, while the transnational giants dispose economic and technological devices to shape it. The analyzed industrial profile of Sweden, Denmark and to a lesser degree Norway back substantially the author's suggestions.

The author arrives at the conclusion that the "industrial niche" strategy, implemented by small Scandinavian countries represents the new form of the international competition between the upper layers of non-monopolized enterprises and transnational monopolies, escaping direct confrontation on the grounds of thoroughly chosen specialization. Though quite efficient for small Scandinavian companies the "industrial niche" strategy cannot secure them from cyclical crises and negative influence of international structural reshaping.

Transition from long prevailed Keynesian doctrines in Great Britain towards monetarism reflects the historic conditions of British imperialism development and also the particulars of the structural adjustment to the changing internal and external economic and sociopolitical environment. The circumstances of class struggle and shifts in the balance of political forces contributed to

this transition too. E. Khesin and V. Studentsov in the article "United Kingdom: From Keynesianism to Monetarism" examine and outline the characteristic features of "thatcherism's" ideology and subsequently policy.

In the ideological field the economic content of the noted socio-economic doctrine can be reduced to the rejection of the active government role in the sphere of macroeconomic regulation as well as on the enterprises' level. In fact "thatcherism" meant the rupture with the postwar traditionally maintained "consensus" between capital and labor. In the field of real policy the monetarist course found its expression in tight money measures and strict fiscal moves of deflation nature, in denationalization and reprivatization of public enterprises, in legislative onslaught on the trade unions' rights and privileges, in numerous actions aimed at deregulation in general. After five years of conservative government's rule the practical results of "thatcherism" for monopolistic bourgeoisie are slow to come and still highly uncertain. The upsurge of strike movement in Great Britain in the beginning of the 1984 testifies that trade unions and the working class in general are full of determination to intensify their struggle against the antidemocratic strategy of the conservative cabinet.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

CSO: 1812/251-E

EDITORIAL ON CPSU CC PLENUM ECONOMIC, POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNNYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6,
Jun 84 pp 3-14

[Editorial: "By a Policy of Communist Creation and Peace"]

[Text]

I

Communist creation and peace--these concepts have become most closely interwoven, organically and indivisibly, in the current era. It was in these two interconnected arterial areas that the 26th CPSU Congress concentrated the forces and will of the party and the entire Soviet people. It determined our basic goals and tasks in the sphere of domestic life and international affairs in the 1980's, formulated precise reference points of the strategy of the Soviet society's gradual transition to the higher phase of the communist formation and outlined the general policy of a struggle for lasting peace in the world ensuring the Soviet country reliable external conditions for creative labor. The 3-plus years which have elapsed since the congress have confirmed convincingly the viability and scientific substantiation of its decisions.

Continuing the high-minded policy line adopted by the party's highest forum, the CPSU Central Committee plenums which have followed it have specified it with regard to the changing requirements of social development and the international situation, which had become dangerously heated. Leninist policy has been further creatively developed in their decisions. Observing constant continuity in its domestic and foreign policy, the party "is proceeding firmly along the chosen path--that of communist creation and peace," as K.U. Chernenko emphasized in his speech at the CPSU Central Committee special February (1984) Plenum. Now, when the Soviet state has reached an extraordinarily critical frontier of the realization of the intentions of the 26th party congress and all that was outlined by the 11th Five-Year Plan, the key areas of further work have been determined by this year's CPSU Central Committee February and April plenums.

In the economic sphere this means acceleration of the development of the national economy and a cardinal increase in its efficiency; the vigorous implementation of measures aimed at the intensification of social production, the speeding up of scientific-technical progress and an improvement in the entire economic mechanism; an improvement in national economic planning;

and an upsurge in every possible way in the people's well-being, which constitutes the highest goal of the activity of the Communist Party and the Soviet state.

In the political sphere this means a further consolidation of the unity and relations of the party with the masses, all-around support for the creativity of the working class and all members of the socialist society; the consistent consolidation of Soviet statehood and the full-fledged deepening and extension of socialist democracy--working, actual democracy; the establishment in all spheres of social life of Bolshevik efficiency oriented toward the achievement of high work results; and an improvement in the style of party leadership and the activity of the state and economic machinery.

In the social sphere this means a strengthening of the foundations of the Soviet way of life; unswerving observance of the socialist principles of social justice; a rise in organization, exactingness and discipline--state, plan, production, contract, labor and financial--and the institution of order in all matters; unconditional struggle against all negative phenomena incompatible with our morality and contrary to socialist legality; the development of man's spiritual values and his consciousness and ideological conviction; and the even closer moral-political cohesion of Soviet society and all nations and nationalities in a single fraternal family, which represents an unprecedented phenomenon in the history of mankind.

In the sphere of international relations this means accomplishment of the world-historical task confronting all mankind--averting the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe, preserving and strengthening peace, overcoming international tension and striving for a return to detente; strengthening our motherland's defense might; further consolidation of the forces of the socialist community and an increase in its role and authority in the world arena; and the establishment in interstate relations of the principle of peaceful coexistence as the sole possible basis under current conditions of the equal and mutually profitable cooperation of countries with different socioeconomic systems.

At the focus of the party's unflagging attention are two tasks of paramount importance. One is the plan-based improvement of the developed socialist society which has been built in the USSR, the upsurge of its production forces and the alignment with their new level of collectivist social relations in the entire diversity of their manifestations in the system of socialist democracy. The other is the salvation of civilization from the threat of world war and the fundamental consolidation of peace, which corresponds to the vital interests of both the Soviet people and all mankind. This is the long-term strategic policy formulated by the 26th party congress.

II

The determining role in the process of improvement of the society of mature socialism belongs to the economy. It has always been and remains the main springboard of the Soviet people's creative activity. For this reason now,

when our country has reached a new historical frontier, the CPSU's efforts are concentrated in the plane of considerable reorganization of the economic mechanism and the entire system of production control, that is, of the pivotal problems of economic development. The party is seeking and finding the optimum paths of their solution and rationally transforming the forms and structures of the economic process.

This is both an economic and political task. And not only because the economy, as V.I. Lenin foresaw, has become for the party the main policy, the policy on whose successes the progressive movement of the Soviet society toward the higher phase of communism, the tackling of social tasks, the strengthening of the defense capability of the Soviet state, the effectiveness of its foreign policy and the consolidation of its international positions depend to a decisive extent. Optimization of the entire national economic complex and its conversion into a single continuously and smoothly functioning mechanism is a comprehensive task. Its accomplishment presupposes the implementation together with economic measures of a broad spectrum of political, social, ideological and organizational measures providing for the fuller fusion of the advantages of developed socialism with the latest achievements of the scientific-technical revolution and the creation of favorable conditions for the continued upsurge of the country's production forces on a qualitatively new level.

The party has made the cornerstone of this great work the intensification of social production, the accelerated introduction into economic practice of the achievements of science, technology and progressive experience and the successful fulfillment of large-scale comprehensive programs. Under today's conditions the struggle for an all-around rise in the efficiency of the national economy represents the actual practical embodiment of Lenin's directive concerning the decisive significance of labor productivity. "We can and want to move forward more quickly," K.U. Chernenko said in a speech to the electorate on 2 March 1984. "We can and must solve problems of the intensive development of the economy far more energetically. After all, the increasingly full satisfaction of the people's material and spiritual requirements is feasible only on this basis." The economy's switch to the tracks of intensification is a gigantic matter which in terms of scale, significance and consequences rightly stands on a par with such most profound transformations as socialist industrialization, which radically transformed the entire appearance of our country.

It is understandable that the simultaneous accomplishment of large-scale production, scientific-technical, socioeconomic and political tasks is an exceptionally complex process. This is work of several years. Life is constantly putting forward new problems, and they will become increasingly complicated and voluminous in line with the ascent of developed socialism from one level of growth to another, higher level. The strategy of movement toward communism elaborated by the party does not, as emphasized at the CPSU Central Committee April (1984) Plenum, have anything in common either with slowness of action or the jumping of historically necessary phases of development. V.I. Lenin said that the entire difficulty and entire art of policy is taking account of the distinctiveness of the tasks of each period

and the distinctiveness of the conditions under which the party operates. He cautioned repeatedly against rashness in the course of communist creation. It is necessary to be particularly prudent and scrupulous in decision-making now, when our state's economic, industrial and scientific-technical potential has grown immeasurably.

In the time separating the elections to the USSR Supreme Soviet which were held on 4 March 1984 from the preceding elections the country's wealth had multiplied considerably and its production forces had been strengthened and appreciably renewed. Over 1,000 new industrial enterprises, which changed for the better entire sectors and regions of the Soviet Union, were commissioned and began to produce. As much fixed capital was commissioned in the period 1979-1983 as had been commissioned by the 50th anniversary of Soviet power. Powerful territorial-production complexes emerged and are continuing to expand. In the 3 years since the 26th CPSU Congress R240 billion more of national income have been produced in the country than in the first 3 years of the 10th Five-Year Plan.

Socialism has always proven and continues to prove its advantages over capitalism by more rapid economic growth and the increase in social labor productivity, full employment, the absence of unemployment and economic crises and the solution of fundamental social problems inaccessible to capitalism. In the past 5 years national income in the USSR increased almost 19 percent, whereas it increased only 6 percent in the United States. In the sphere of industrial production the correlation of the dynamics is thus--18 and 1 percent. And, what is particularly important, in this same period labor productivity in the industry of the Soviet Union increased 14 percent, whereas in the United States it increased 3 percent.

By mid-1984 the strength of the armies of unemployed in all capitalist countries will have exceeded 33 million according to official data alone. In the United States, the West's wealthiest country, 24 million adults are illiterate, 35 million live below the poverty line and 2 million are without a roof over their heads. Soviet people are spared these "accursed problems" engendered by capitalism.

The year of 1983 and the first months of the present year also produced a particularly impressive result for the Soviet economy. The large-scale change toward the new stage of the USSR's economic progress was initiated by the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) Plenum, which formulated a set of measures which imparted great dynamism and powerful acceleration to the national economy and afforded an opportunity for embarking on overcoming the unpleasant trend of the first 2 years of the 11th Five-Year Plan, when there was a deceleration of the economic growth rate. Now, 18 months later, we can see distinctly the tremendous transforming force of the political potential summoned into being by this plenum. The great deal of organizing and political work undertaken by the party Central Committee and its Politburo and the entire 18.5-million-strong army of communists is already bearing fruit. The attunement to actual and specific deeds and the practical accomplishment of the impending tasks is being reflected positively in the end results of the entire labor process.

The results of 1983 confirm that the economy has begun to develop more steadily and rapidly and that its efficiency is increasing. The highest industrial production growth rate in the past 5 years was achieved. There was an improvement in matters in transport, capital construction and investment practice. The labor productivity growth rate surpassed the average annual indicators of the past year and the first 2 years of this 5-year plan. The material consumption of social production declined. The positive changes in agriculture and the realization of the Food Program are palpable also. The first results of its implementation were discussed by an all-union economic conference on problems of the agrarian-industrial complex held at the end of March this year, which revealed the colossal potential contained in the Soviet economy's agrarian sector. The policy of the preferential growth of the production of consumer products is being pursued consistently. The average monthly wage of workers and employees amounted to R182, and kolkhoz members' pay to R138. Real income per capita increased 13 percent.

A good start has been made in 1984 also. The increase in total industrial output in the first quarter compared with the corresponding period of last year constituted 4.9 percent. Labor productivity increased 4.6 percent compared with the 3.4 percent of the annual plan. Some 96 percent of the increase in production was obtained thanks to the increase therein. Workers of industry and railroad transport as a whole honorably kept their word to the party--they achieved an above-plan labor productivity increase of 1 percent and a reduction in prime production costs of 0.5 percent.

Much has been done, and positive improvements can be seen. The state plan of economic and social development is being fulfilled successfully, and our economy is switching with increasing confidence to the path of intensification. The country has advanced markedly in all areas of economic and social progress. Soviet people note with satisfaction the visible changes which have become a part of their lives thanks to the measures formulated by the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) and subsequent plenums.

However, there are no grounds for complacency. The situation is not such as to permit us to erase off and manage without a further increase in the intensity of economic work. What has been achieved is only the initial stage of a great deal of prolonged creative activity. We have as yet managed to achieve improvements in economic indicators, quality indicators included, only thanks to the mobilization of the intrinsic potential present, so to speak, on the surface, without any significant enlistment of additional material, financial and labor resources. The main thing now is, without stopping, to proceed further and more rapidly toward new conquests, consolidate, develop and multiply all that is positive in the economy and other spheres of social life and make good the lag in a number of links of the national economy.

The party demands that we evaluate what has been done realistically, comprehensively and in balanced manner, not belittling, but also not exaggerating it, proceed without a shadow of utopia from the evolved realities with all their pluses and minuses and overcome the discrepancy which has been revealed by life between the wealth of possibilities of socialist social relations and how they are used in practice. Only such an approach ensures the strict scientific character of policy and enables us to see clearly

"what exactly we have 'finished' and what we have not finished."* And much still needs to be "finished". It is a question of the fact that the stage of developed socialism, at the start of which the Soviet society now is, is a historically lengthy period and that en route to the communist ideal the socialist ideal has still to be embodied in practice and many big and complex tasks inherent by their origin and nature in the first phase of communism have to be tackled. This today is the key to the improvement of mature socialism.

Conducting an open, honest conversation with the masses, the party does not conceal the fact that we have many tasks still to tackle, unremoved contradictions and bottlenecks and shortcomings which have to be removed as soon as possible. Having analyzed the course of fulfillment of the current 5-year plan with regard for the results of the work of the first quarter of the current year, the CPSU Central Committee pointed out at the regular session at the end of April 1984 that the overall favorable indicators in a number of instances still conceal an unsatisfactory situation in certain important sectors of the economy. Full use is not being made of operating capacity. There are great losses of work time, and the targets for economies in fuel, raw material and other resources are not being met everywhere. Even in the sectors which are fulfilling the plan successfully there are many lagging enterprises. A fundamental breakthrough in the observance of supply discipline has not been achieved.

Two basic problems have been brought to the fore in the current situation. First of all, making more efficient use of the vast production potential, loading available capacity more fully, striving for the utmost economies in resources, using work time solicitously and with full input, achieving greater efficiency in the work of the management bodies and declaring merciless war on all conceivable losses and sloppiness, conservatism and sluggishness and bureaucratism and lack of responsibility. At the same time a cardinal increase in labor productivity and the consistent intensification of the economy demand the concentration of efforts on the solution of a second problem--an acceleration of scientific-technical progress and the introduction in production of technology which is progressive in all respects, the retooling of the economy and the speediest recovery of expenditure on modernization. A fundamental improvement in the work of the entire machinery of state, an increase in the personnel's personal responsibility and optimization of the economic mechanism as a most important component of the overall process of an improvement in our entire social system represent an urgent requirement of the present day and a program goal for the future. In tackling current tasks the CPSU and its Central Committee do not lose sight of the communist future and are creating the necessary process stock and prerequisites for the achievement of far higher boundaries in the coming decades. It is from such positions that the party and the Soviet state approach the formation of the 12th Five-Year Plan, which is designed to secure a decisive breakthrough in the intensification of the national economy based on a considerable acceleration of scientific-technical progress, replacement of the country's production capital and an increase in the technical level and quality of the implements of labor.

* V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 44, p 417.

Elaboration of the comprehensive program of our country's scientific-technical progress in 1986-2005 is continuing simultaneously. As the USSR Council of Ministers' statement on its impending activity made at the 11th USSR Supreme Soviet First Session this April said, the government is currently working on the draft Basic Directions of Economic and Social Development in 1986-1990 and the long term up to the year 2000. These documents will have to determine the main contours of the economy, science and technology with which the Soviet state will enter the third millennium. This long-term orientation of the party's economic and scientific-technical policy embodies, in V.I. Lenin's words, "the general plan of our work, our policy, our tactics, our strategy...."*

III

Perfecting developed socialism means not only raising the economy to new heights but working tirelessly on the spiritual growth of the builders of the communist society, shaping the man of the new world, the man of the future, and fostering the harmoniously developed personality.

Radical changes in the entire political superstructure of society and in people's consciousness have to be accomplished simultaneously with the progress of production relations and their alignment with the qualitative changes in the production forces. It is essential in transforming man's material living conditions at the same time to do everything for his ideological-moral elevation. The success of the party's strategic course aimed at the gradual growth of the present phase of the socioeconomic maturity of the Soviet society into a higher phase of social development is inconceivable without the high level of consciousness and social assertiveness of the working people, without the extensive development of the initiative and creativity of the masses and without their most effective enlistment in the solution of the key problems confronting the country. Ultimately our economy is obliged for each of its major achievements to the creative initiatives and successes of the labor collectives.

Ideological, mass-political and educational work is moving to the fore increasingly in this connection and its role and significance in the life of society are growing. The documents and decisions of the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) and April (1984) plenums and the speeches thereat of K.U. Chernenko were imbued with concern for blending it more closely with economic and organizing practice, ensuring their invigorating unity more fully and thereby activating the creative forces of the people as fully as possible. The latter's speech at the April Plenum and his speech at the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium session on 13 April 1984 revealed the potential for the stimulation of the masses which is contained in a further improvement of socialist democracy and the entire political system of society and, primarily, in an improvement in the activity of the soviets--the political basis of the USSR--and showed how to activate this potential.

* V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 45, p 405.

The time predicted by V.I. Lenin, when under socialism "the mass of the population ascends to independent participation not only in voting and elections but also in day-to-day control"** and when the soviets become organs of state leadership working not only for the working people but also via the working people,*** has come. Some 2.3 million deputies--the progressive, most authoritative representatives of the people, possessing the necessary political and practical qualities and accumulating the people's experience, wisdom and creative energy; and tens of millions of activists--these are via whom affairs of state are conducted here. Simultaneously this is also an important indicator of the possibilities of the more than 50,000 soviets of peoples' deputies of all levels--from settlement and rural through the USSR Supreme Soviet. The elections of 4 March 1984 were new evidence of the blossoming of socialist democracy and the universal support for the policy course of the Lenin Party.

The soviets have broad rights, particularly following the adoption of the new USSR Constitution. Nonetheless, their tremendous potential is being realized insufficiently fully, in particular, the role of the local soviets in economic and cultural building and their responsibility for the solution of social questions and fuller satisfaction of the working people's requirements are not increasing quickly enough. The party sets the task: strive persistently to ensure that the soviets' constitutional rights be used in full, eradicate formalism in their activity, get rid of passiveness and occupy active, creative positions in all matters. The organs of democracy are called on in practice to provide for the working people's most active, conscious and concerned participation in control of the national economy and all affairs of society and the state. The legislative, executive, managerial and control functions of the soviets should serve to organize and develop the energy of the masses.

Together with an increase in the soviets' influence on the course of economic and cultural building the CPSU Central Committee April Plenum outlined specific measures to increase the efficiency of their control of the management authorities, ensure the comprehensiveness of economic and social development, satisfy more fully the everyday and other needs of the population and raise Soviet people in a spirit of internationalism and readiness to defend their motherland and the gains of socialism. Having analyzed in depth the basic directions of the activity of the organs of Soviet power under the conditions of developed socialism the plenum pointed to the need to use every method of party influence to enhance their efficiency, defining this as the main party task in leadership of the soviets.

An action of tremendous social significance is the reform of the Soviet school. Following the 3-month discussion by all Soviet society, the "Basic Directions of the Reform of the General Educational and Vocational School" were approved by the CPSU Central Committee April Plenum and the USSR Supreme Soviet. Now this fundamental document, in accordance with which the school has in the future to live and operate, has acquired the force of state law; its implementation is

* V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 45, p 405.

** Ibid., vol 33, p 116.

already beginning. It embodies and further develops Lenin's ideas concerning the labor and polytechnical school and its role in the formation of the comprehensively developed personality and contains a scientifically substantiated strategic program of a qualitative improvement of general secondary and vocational education and an improvement in its structure and the communist upbringing of the younger generations, which will contribute to the acceleration of our society's economic and social progress.

The social function of education is enriched appreciably under the conditions of developed socialism. While providing the high level of knowledge essential for continued tuition, the school is at the same time called on to orient the youth toward socially useful labor in the national economy and prepare it for this. The reform, which is based over two 5-year plans, is aimed at the students' in-depth assimilation of the fundamentals of the sciences, the development of their capacity for independent creative thinking, the formation in them of a firm communist world outlook, Marxist-Leninist conviction, industriousness and moral purity and their upbringing in a spirit of proletarian internationalism and responsibility for the fate of the socialist motherland. Such is the calling of the Soviet school.

The role of the human, personal factor at the current stage of communist building is greater than ever before. With reference to the economy this is brought about primarily by the novelty, complexity and scale of the tasks being tackled by our society. The significance of Lenin's thought that the broader the scale and more profound the transformations, the more people have to be enlisted in these actions on the basis of extensive explanatory work, conviction and upbringing is revealed particularly forcefully now. The party abides unswervingly by V.I. Lenin's behest concerning the strengthening of ties to the people and reliance on the assertiveness of the masses in the creation and defense of the new society.

IV

The Soviet people are having to tackle the gigantic tasks of communist creation and an improvement in the people's life under difficult foreign policy conditions. The international situation is not simply heated, it is at times assuming an extremely alarming, explosive nature. The deployment of the new American first-strike nuclear missiles in direct proximity to the borders of the USSR and our socialist allies in Europe which began at the end of last year sharply increased both military and political tension throughout the world and broke up the Geneva negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States.

The seriousness of the threat to universal peace engendered by the aggressive policy of imperialism, primarily American, cannot be underestimated. Weapons systems and types of unprecedented power of destruction are being developed, it is intended to convert space into a new field of the arms race, which will have unpredictable consequences, the accuracy, speed of response and lethal power of the arms are being increased and the production of neutron bombs and binary and stun means of exterminating everything living on Earth has begun.

The concepts connected with their use and various outlines of a "limited" nuclear conflict and a "protracted" nuclear war are being rethought. The U.S. Administration was the initiator and instigator of the most dangerous twist of the arms race spiral.

The situation is made worse by out-and-out international terrorism, which has been elevated to the rank of official U.S. policy, and imperialist plunder in a multitude of areas of the world. Pouring dirt on our social system, socialist democracy and way of life and economy, this country's ruling circles are perpetrating barbaric crimes against mankind, brazenly flouting the peoples' right to sovereign development and unleashing the most regular wars against states which have displeased the White House in some way or other. The bandit action against Grenada, which the civilized world will not forget and for which it will never forgive Washington, the undeclared war in Nicaragua, the outrages in El Salvador and Lebanon and the predatory attacks on Angola and Mozambique carried out by the South African racists--a trail of blood follows American imperialism everywhere. Its intrigues against Afghanistan and Kampuchea and threats against socialist Cuba are incessant.

The imperialist circles of the United States and many of its NATO allies have inflicted heavy losses on detente. Devoted to hegemonism and the imperialist policy of world domination, the U.S. Administration regards our entire planet as its patrimony and has taken the path of open aggression, sabotage and flagrant interference in the affairs of other countries and peoples and the suppression of national-democratic movements on all continents. It aspires in this way to exact social revenge for imperialism's defeats in past decades, restore its lost positions and find a way out of the historical blind alley in which the present-day capitalist society, whose general crisis is continuing to deepen despite everything, has ended up.

It is not given to imperialism to overcome its consequences. The capitalist countries have gotten out of the latest devastating world economic crisis with difficulty, but the unprecedented unemployment of many millions, the rise in prices and inflation, the crisis of capitalism's international currency-finance system and many other of its defects remain. These countries' ruling circles are powerless to put forward a positive democratic prospect for their peoples, but are resorting nonetheless to the use of all means and methods at their disposal of defending the historically outdated system. Everything is being activated here--social demagogery and economic, political and ideological blackmail.

The West's reactionary and adventurist forces which are at the helm of state administration experience a genuine nostalgia for the times, which have disappeared into the past, when they could decide peoples' fate with impunity. They are endeavoring to switch present-day capitalism to the "historical counteroffensive" and for this purpose are prepared not only to cancel out all the gains of the period of detente but as a whole to shake the sole acceptable and reasonable basis of relations between states with different social systems--peaceful coexistence. Such a path is not to the liking of those who have conceived an intention to turn back the objective course of historical development, who are not suited by the balance of world forces, which is changing inexorably in favor of socialism, and who fear the prospects of the world revolutionary process, which is developing actively in all directions.

The "crusade" against socialism as a social system proclaimed by the R. Reagan administration developed not only into an abandonment of detente policy but also into attempts, vain, it is true, to break up in its favor the military-strategic parity which has evolved in the world and into an escalation of the pathological hostility toward the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community. But the financial-oligarchical elite ruling in the United States links more than just political hopes with the "crusade". An exhausting and costly arms race is being foisted on the Soviet state, and a mechanism of so-called economic sanctions and every conceivable prohibition and embargo is being activated. All this is aimed at weakening the Soviet Union and holding back its dynamic development or, as American politicos cynically declare, at "economic death".

The years that have elapsed have revealed the utter groundlessness of such calculations. They have been an important landmark of the further consolidation of the international positions and authority of our country and the entire socialist community and the growth of its might and influence on the entire course of world events. They appear today before all peoples as the main bastion of peace in the world. The voice of socialism, which is conducting a consistent purposeful struggle for the consolidation of international security, in defense of cooperation, for the restoration of detente and trust between all states and for the freedom and independence of the peoples, democracy and social progress, resounds powerfully and convincingly. Mankind is obliged for the fact that the trend toward peace continues, that detente, whose roots are very deep, is by no means a stage that is passed and that the future ultimately belongs to it to our power, the other socialist countries and the progressive public of all states. "Soviet people are profoundly convinced that it is possible to preserve peace," K.U. Chernenko said at a meeting with workers of Moscow's "Serp i molot" Foundry on 29 April 1984. "It is possible to turn the development of events away from confrontation toward detente. We are ready for dialogue and ready to actively cooperate with states and organizations which want to work honestly and constructively in the name of peace."

The Soviet Union's high-minded position on cardinal issues of the current international situation and the prospects of the solution of problems of war and peace has been set forth as clearly and precisely as could be in K.U. Chernenko's speech at the CPSU Central Committee February and April plenums, in his election speech, at meetings with foreign statesmen and public figures, in answers to questions from PRAVDA, to an appeal by leading figures of the Socialist International and to a message of a delegation of the city of Assisi and representatives of the Franciscan Order and in other documents.

Speaking at a dinner on 4 May in honor of W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Polish United Workers Party Central Committee and chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, K.U. Chernenko emphasized: "As before, we are convinced that there are real possibilities for a decisive improvement in the international situation. And the broad set of proposals put forward by the Soviet Union in conjunction with other socialist countries represents the necessary basis for this. They afford an opportunity for the achievement of mutually acceptable accords which would make it possible to deliver mankind from the nuclear threat, put an end to the arms race, primarily nuclear, and switch to disarmament."

The peace initiatives being advanced by the Soviet Union constitute a far-reaching all-embracing practical program of an improvement in international relations. The fundamental issue here is curbing the race in nuclear arms, banning and destroying all types thereof and completely liberating Europe therefrom. Our country has submitted proposals on two particularly important and large-scale measures aimed at strengthening peace and security--on the adoption by all powers possessing nuclear weapons, in the wake of the Soviet Union, of a commitment not to be the first to use them and on the conclusion of a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations.

In May 1984, on the eve of the resumption of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures, Security and Disarmament in Europe, the ambassadors of the NATO countries in Budapest were handed an appeal on behalf of the Warsaw Pact states concerning the conclusion of such a treaty. The appeal contains a number of propositions revealing the breadth of the approach and the all-embracing nature of the proposal. The treaty commitment not to use force should extend not only to the territories of the states subscribing to the treaty but also to their military and civilian personnel, ships, airships and space vehicles and other facilities belonging to them, wherever they may be. The treaty could incorporate a similar commitment not to use force in respect of third countries and not to threaten the safety of international sea, air and space communications across space to which no one's national jurisdiction extends. Finally, the treaty could record a commitment to lead matters toward a halt to the arms race and the limitation of and reduction in arms--both nuclear and conventional.

Adoption of the rules of conduct proposed by the USSR, which are designed to regulate relations between nuclear powers, would contribute to a tremendous extent to an improvement in the entire international climate. The compilation of such rules would absolutely justifiably acquire the appellation of a peace code in the nuclear age. It represents a logical continuation and development of the peace programs adopted by the 24th-26th CPSU congresses, which go back to Lenin's Decree on Peace and inherit their principles from the policy of peaceful coexistence proclaimed by V.I. Lenin.

Simultaneously the peace code has imbued the basic demands and most important propositions and proposals of the planet's peace-loving forces struggling against nuclear death. This is significant to the highest degree, again testifying that the principles of the USSR's foreign policy are consonant with the interests and will of all peoples which aspire to curb aggressors, concur with mankind's fundamental interests and correspond to his cherished aspirations and ideas concerning peace and international security. The adventurist policy of the United States and a number of other NATO countries and the decisions of the governments of Great Britain, the FRG and Italy to give the go-ahead to the installation and bringing to combat readiness on their territories of American medium-range nuclear missiles are opposed by the overwhelming majority of the peoples and states of Europe and the whole world. Contrary to the hopes of imperialist politicians for a decline in the antiwar, antinuclear and antimissile movement, it continues to grow, attracting increasingly new millions of people.

The fact that at the very height of Washington's latest militarist campaign the UN General Assembly's 38th Session adopted on the Soviet Union's initiative by a huge majority a declaration which decisively and unreservedly condemns nuclear war as a most heinous crime against mankind is by no means fortuitous. Is this not graphic testimony to the moral-political isolation into which the imperialist hawks are now falling?

The CPSU decisions emphasize: Soviet communists are sincerely heartened by the fact that in the struggle for a peaceful future and the progress of mankind we are proceeding hand in hand with millions of class brothers and numerous detachments of the world communist and workers movement. Invariably loyal to the principle of proletarian internationalism, we treat with ardent sympathy and profound respect the struggle for our foreign comrades for the interests and rights of the working people and see it as our duty to strengthen the ties that bind us in every possible way.

The Soviet people, the peoples of the fraternal socialist countries and all progressive people of the world solemnly commemorated in May the 39th anniversary of the Soviet Union's victory in the 1941-1945 Great Patriotic War, which had the most profound impact on the fate of mankind and the entire course of world development. As a result of the way the German-fascist aggressors and Japanese militarists were crushed and the myths concerning the invincibility of the armies of aggression and the illusion concerning the world domination of the imperialist adventurists were dispelled. The positions of imperialism weakened sharply, and the forces of peace, social progress and socialism strengthened and expanded considerably. The Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War demonstrated once again the illusory nature of the policy of the most aggressive imperialist forces aimed at the destruction of socialism. The future is with socialism. At the same time this victory showed at what an inconceivably costly price peace is won. The Great Victory calls all people of good will to active and resolute struggle for its preservation and consolidation.

V

The 27th party congress is drawing near. The CPSU is proceeding toward it fully armed, enriched with the sure experience of political and organizing work and economic building and relying on the monolithic unity of party and people. Having even now begun direct preparations for the congress, it is actively mobilizing its collective thought and creating thorough ideological process stock. After all, the congress will have to discuss and adopt a most important ideological-theoretical and political party document--a new version of the CPSU Program--and for this it will be necessary to underpin it with a solid general theoretical foundation and simultaneously organically link it with well-substantiated economic plans and forecasts. This will afford an opportunity to create an objective realistic picture of the improvement of the developed socialist society and the gradual advance toward communism. At the meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Commission for Preparing the New Version of the CPSU Program on 25 April K.U. Chernenko dwelt on the key issues connected with its nature and content.

As always, the preparations for the next congress are a period of interpretation and the summing up of what has been achieved, a period of active consolidation of everything positive achieved by our people. At the same time they are also a time for a self-critical analysis of shortcomings and determination of the ways of surmounting them, and the main thing, ways of tackling major new tasks, a time of work of large scale and many levels. Displaying constant and active concern for all that by which the people and the entire country live, the party is pointing to the need to attentively examine the course of fulfillment of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress in all spheres of social life.

It is the duty of the Communist Party to constantly match its policy and its decisions, actions and plans primarily with the thoughts of the working class and with its tremendous sociopolitical and class sensitivity. V.I. Lenin, the 114th anniversary of whose birth our people and all progressive mankind solemnly commemorated in April, always valued highly the straightforwardness, vital substantiation and clarity of the opinions of the working man, heeded his opinion and evaluations of events and people responsively and sought and found in them answers to the most urgent questions.

The working class is by its very nature a creative class. The Communist Party, which is now the vanguard of the whole Soviet people, was and remains by its class essence, program goals, ideology and policy and by the part which workers play in the CPSU the party of the working class loyal to the glorious traditions of Bolshevism.

The experience of the working class interpreted in the light of Marxist-Leninist teaching and theory constantly enriched by new experience have always constituted and continue to constitute a most important source of the strength and invincibility of the Lenin Party. This is the guarantee that our people will tackle successfully the far-reaching tasks of communist creation confronting them. And whereas the preservation of peace is a matter not just of our good will, here everything depends entirely on us ourselves and on our capability and ability to work and embody the great plans in reality.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850
CSO: 1816/10

GREATER WESTERN 'POLITICIZING' OF ECONOMY THEORY NOTED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6,
Jun 84 pp 15-26

[Article by Academician A. Mileykovskiy: "Bourgeois Political Economy and Problems of Economic Policy at the Current Stage"]

[Text] F. Engels observed that "political economy is essentially a historical science. It deals with historical, that is, constantly changing, material."**

A critique of bourgeois political economy for this reason presupposes the need for a constant study not only of general regularities of development but also a specific analysis of the methods of use of this theory for political purposes. No less important also is an analysis of its applied significance in the global strategy of state-monopoly regulation of the world capitalist economy which is being exercised currently, which is designed to provide for the expanded reproduction of bourgeois production relations on our planet in order to hold back the development of the world revolutionary process.

Bourgeois political economy's fulfillment globally of two functions--ideological and practical--is manifested distinctly here.

Bourgeois political economy at the current stage is putting forward far-reaching goals--not only of superseding socialism but also seeking its liquidation as a social system. Bourgeois political economy conceals its counterrevolutionary strategy by dogmatic concepts designed to refute historical materialism, which substantiated the practicability of the transition of all mankind to communism, and also the law of surplus value, which inexorably leads to an exacerbation of the antagonisms of the capitalist society making inevitable its revolutionary transformation into a socialist society.

The growing might of the revolutionary forces opposed to the outdated system of imperialist domination is causing panic fear in the rulers of the old world. The fanatics of bellicose anticommunism are calling even for acceptance of the risk of "limited" or "protracted" nuclear war, which threatens the loss of

* The basis of the article is a paper by the author at a roundtable meeting on problems of criticism of contemporary bourgeois political economy teachings held in Sofia by NOVO VREME, the theoretical and political journal of the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee, in November 1983.

** K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 20, p 151.

millions of people, in the name of preservation of their celebrated "free world".

The ideologists of present-day imperialism are attempting to depict the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism as the dawn of "postindustrial civilization," the "model" of which is allegedly already taking shape in the industrial capitalist countries on the basis of the scientific-technical revolution.

The considerable changes in the scale of the ideological struggle demand a new approach to an analysis of the regularities of the development of contemporary bourgeois political economy.

Structural Changes in Bourgeois Economic Science

Under current conditions it is no longer possible to speak of the "de-ideologization" of bourgeois political economy. Problems of policy and strategy--the confrontation of the two social systems and also the struggle against the international worker and national liberation movements--are moving to the forefront therein.

And it is this which ruling circles of the capitalist countries are demanding of economists. Thus BUSINESS WEEK, the influential weekly of American business circles, wrote: "All who expected from the recent session of the American Economic Association decisions or, at least, fresh ideas concerning the problems confronting both the United States and the whole world were considerably disappointed. The session clearly revealed the degree of intellectual backwardness of this profession, which manifested itself even in the formulation of the questions requiring urgent answers. The list of urgent questions not examined at this meeting is profoundly disappointing. Not one paper on problems of the low growth rate of the Western economy... on the state of East-West relations or between the developed and developing countries.... Although in the business of controlling the economy we in the United States rely on monetarist policy, economists are incapable of answering such an important question as determination of the role of money, and monetarism even increases the vagueness, moreover. Nor were there serious attempts to ascertain how the huge budget deficits are influencing the economy, although the deficits in the next 3 years could grow to more than \$100 billion annually. And, finally, despite the fact that President Reagan's attempts to reduce the role of government were supported even by many liberal economists, those present at the session put forward no new ideas on how a reduction in government spending would be able to cope with the problems of a modern democratic society.... This is a serious question confronting the world community, and the economists should at least have asked it."*

The priority of politics over "economies" was manifested distinctly in the springing up of research centers, which were new for bourgeois economic science and whose main task was the development of the world strategy of imperialism.

* BUSINESS WEEK, 18 January 1982, p 90.

The impetus for this institutional reorganization of bourgeois economic science was provided by a number of events which revealed the political and economic instability of capitalism and which characterize the deepening of its general crisis. The defeat of American imperialism in Vietnam and the unfolding 1974-1975 unusual cyclical and structural economic crisis, which was characterized, as distinct from all previous crises, not by a decline in the prices of commodities ensuring the possibility of capitalism's way out of the crisis thanks to the gradual resorption of accumulated commodity stocks but, on the contrary, by a sharp rise in prices and galloping inflation undermining the foundations of capitalism's entire credit system, represented the prologue.

The meetings of leaders of the main capitalist countries, which have been held annually since 1975, were a qualitatively new stage in the formation of a supranational institution of state-monopoly strategic regulation of the economy. The London meeting (1977) was of particular significance in the development of the general outlines of this strategy. It made an attempt to formulate a new Marshall Plan for Europe and to establish a new system of economic and political relations between the industrial capitalist and developing countries. The role of "locomotives" capable of pulling the capitalist economy out of the quagmire of economic and political crises was assigned the United States, the FRG and Japan. Britain, France and Italy were acknowledged the subject of the aid, the "medicine" being assistance to them in reducing the balance of payments deficits and in the struggle against the forces of the left, which had created "political instability". At the same time, however, the American representatives demanded of the NATO partner-conferees and also Japan an increase in military spending.

The meetings of the Seven are preceded by scientific conferences and symposia of sorts--unofficial international meetings of representatives of the imperialist countries' financial oligarchy. Thus the so-called Trilateral Commission was founded in 1973 on the initiative of D. Rockefeller, chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank. It included business magnates and political figures and also scientific experts of the United States, West Europe and Japan. Papers and recommendations on the most important problems of imperialism's economic, political and military strategy are the result of conferences and symposia organized by the commission.

The timing of such formal and informal meetings serves as a convincing illustration of the fact that the most important political and strategic decisions influencing the fate of the peoples of the capitalist countries are made not by the parliaments but as a result of "private" and "quiet" diplomacy.

The close interaction of the governments of the main capitalist countries and the financial oligarchy of imperialism based on such diplomacy is brought about by such a qualitatively new factor of international relations as the gigantic increase in the power of the transnational corporations [TNC], which perform the role of subject of the world policy of imperialism, similar to that which was previously performed by the governments of big states. The decisions adopted by the general directors of the TNC, which incorporate dozens of

countries in the sphere of domination of their empires, now determine to a considerable extent the movement of both commodities and capital on a world scale. The state of the balance of payments and the level of unemployment of individual countries frequently depend on these decisions to a greater extent than on the fiscal and credit-monetary policy of their governments.

The increased interaction of the research centers and bourgeois economists of individual countries is also a result of the emergence of supranational headquarters of state-monopoly anticrisis regulation. The conference on the political economy of the United States held in the Auguste Compte Institute in Paris in September 1981 may serve as an illustration of such interaction. More than 30 American and approximately 100 French experts participated. This conference was the second in a series of meetings between economists of the two countries on problems of the comparative economy of the United States and France.*

The new economic policy of the R. Reagan administration was thoroughly discussed in Paris. Since Reaganomics was examined in the broad context of the United States' postwar development and the evolution of macro- and microeconomic ideas the term "political economy" was employed in the title of the book and not economic policy. The author of the introduction, Ch. Stoffaes (the Paris Political Studies Institute), observes that Reaganomics signifies a sharp break with the preceding development of economic thought, and its success or failure will exert tremendous influence on the entire world economy.

The Paris conference graphically reflected the structural changes in bourgeois political economy connected with the fact that as of the start of the 1980's the world capitalist economy entered a new stage of its development--a state of profound and protracted economic crisis. The appearance of Reaganomics is regarded as a result of diverse trends which manifested themselves in the 1970's: "The economic result of a decade of stagflation and the failure of the various measures aimed at combating it. The political result following from the appeal to the conservatism of the greater part of public opinion. The intellectual result attesting the public's disenchantment with economists and government interference in economic and social activity.... The intellectual roots of Reagan's doctrine need to be sought in nontraditional circles, outside of the academic and political establishment, and whereas the Kennedy program of the start of the 1960's was the result of the unification of academic scholars who had turned to Keynesian ideas... and concerned socioeconomic groups which were the bastion of democratic parties (the trade union movement and the national minorities), supply-side economics was born of an alliance of peripheral intellectuals and politicians...."** The academic establishment greeted the doctrine of supply-side economics skeptically. However, it was supported by such well-known scholars as M. Friedman, M. Feldstein, A. Greenspan and G. Shultz. But the Reaganites claim that it was precisely the professional economists and

* See "The Political Economy of the United States". Edited by Ch. Stoffaes. Amsterdam--New York--Oxford, 1982. The first conference, which was devoted to France's political economy, was held in Washington by the AEI.

** "The Political Economy of the United States," pp 32, 33.

former governments which had driven the country into a blind alley with their technocratic recommendations.

The appearance of Reaganomics itself was brought about by the growth of the contradictions and difficulties of the capitalist economy. The point being that the "locomotives" of capitalism--the United States, the FRG and Japan--not only were unable to accelerate their movement and pull the other countries with them but decelerated their progress even. They not only were unable to regulate competition but in the struggle for markets within the Seven brought it to a state of unprecedented exacerbation. At the start of the 1980's capitalism entered a period of new economic crisis, the particular gravity of which was conditioned by the fact that it hit a weakened economy. A decline in the production growth rate in the developing countries began simultaneously with the crisis, which had embraced all the main capitalist countries.

"Record" indicators were set by unemployment, the number of bankruptcies and the underloading of the production machinery. The speediest of the "locomotives"--Japan--also had to spin its wheels. In 1980 private capital investments in machinery and equipment in this country increased 8 percent (in 1975 prices), 5.6 percent in 1981 and only 1.9 percent in 1982. The reasons for the decline in investments were the deterioration of the financial position of the companies, particularly the small and medium companies, and the decline in exports. The ruling circles are seeking a way out of the crisis thanks to an unconcealed offensive against the living standard of the broad people's masses and the switch of the economy to the tracks of militarization. In 1983 Japan virtually became part of the NATO system, and its companies are establishing close cooperation in arms production with all the participants in this bloc.

However, at the Paris conference prominent American economists did not criticize Reaganomics. L. Cline observed, it is true, that the Reagan program is intrinsically contradictory. He emphasized that its most probable outcome would be a growth of the budget deficit. But, he believed, Reagan's strategy has strong historical roots. In the United States, he declared, politicians come and go, but economic policy follows its established path, shifting, where necessary, sometimes toward more microeconomic, sometimes toward more structural measures, depending on the changing conditions.

P. McCracken confined himself to just a few critical observations in respect of Reagan's policy and observed that an achievement thereof are the changes in the direction of a limitation of the wilfulness of government in controlling economic policy.

A more definite and scrupulous position was held by L. Turow. He comprehensively criticized the conservatives' basic proposition that greater equality in income exerts a destimulating influence on economic growth. As is known, the R. Reagan administration has by its economic policy effected a pronounced redistribution of income in favor of the high-income groups of American society. Turow predicts that the 1980's will be a period of increasing equality in the United States.

Former French Premier P. Barre, who spoke at the conference, warmly approved of Reagan's cutback in social programs, which are a "serious burden on the economy

of all developed countries and which have brought about a situation which cannot be supported for long. This is why the American example has prompted many countries (the FRG, Belgium, the Netherlands and Italy) to limit spending and reduce budget deficits. This is undoubtedly the correct way...."*

'Logic' and Madness of Present-Day Imperialist Militarization

Upon an evaluation of the new trends in the development of bourgeois political economy it is essential to take account of the aggressive militarist preparations of unprecedented scale which have become an inalienable part of the policy of the West's ruling circles. The forces of imperialism and reaction headed by the United States are now openly making concerted preparations for war against the Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole.

The "Directives in the Defense Sphere for the 1984-1988 Fiscal Years," which were developed at the behest of the U.S. President, testify how far the Reagan administration has gone in the preparation of such a war. This official document sets as the main goal the "elimination of socialism as a sociopolitical system". The United States is persistently building up its strategic forces, gambling on a nuclear first strike against the Warsaw Pact countries. At the start of the 1980's the United States adopted a new strategy of "direct confrontation" and with regard for this is increasing efforts for the use of its forces in new parts of the world. Graphic confirmation of this are large-scale military exercises and maneuvers, the strengthening of existing and creation of new military bases and extensive military assistance to reactionary regimes in Latin America, the Near and Middle East, southern Africa and Southeast Asia. New commands have been set up--the Central Command for the leadership of troop groupings in the Near and Middle East; a command of U.S. armed forces in the Caribbean zone; and the Air Force Space Command. The reorganization of forces and control bodies in accordance with the Army-90 program is being undertaken vigorously.

Employing means of pressure and blackmail, the United States has achieved the deployment in West Europe of Pershings and cruise missiles as first-strike weapons. At the same time qualitatively new conventional means of warfare which are capable even in the nonnuclear war of exterminating everything living over vast areas are being created.

The "logic" of the current imperialist arms race leads to a war which could threaten catastrophe for all civilization and lead to the extermination of all forms of life on our planet. This "logic" is tantamount to madness.

However, there is in it a certain system, the essence of which was long since revealed by Marxist-Leninist theory. It is engendered by the real interests of the military-industrial complex, investments in which secure the highest guaranteed profits, irrespective of market fluctuations. K. Marx even observed that, given very high profits, there is no crime to which the capitalist would not assent, even on pain of the gallows.

* "The Political Economy of the United States," p 129.

President Reagan embodies the minted type of politician representing the interests of the military-industrial complex. He is distinguished by extreme adventurism and pathological anticommunism. In Reagan's career a big part was played by his anticommunist activeness in the period of McCarthyism, when he was a leader of the fight against the "reds" in Hollywood. As a bellicose anticommunist, he was assessed as a promising politician by Californian magnates, who made him governor of the state. Since then Reagan has loyally served the owners of California's "death concerns". The military programs which the U.S. Administration is hastening to implement are sufficiently convincing testimony to this.

In creating an atmosphere of anticommunist hysteria, kindling nationalism and employing methods of social demagogery, R. Reagan announces candidly the gamble on military strength. Here is one of his statements: "We will maintain sufficient power to prevail. I do not think that a declaration renouncing first use of nuclear weapons serves any useful purpose." Just as unequivocal is the credo of U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger: "If the transition from the cold war to detente was progress, we cannot permit ourselves such progress.... We will spend what is necessary to increase America's military power and acquire an advantage over the Soviet Union."

We would emphasize that even many representatives of the United States' ruling circles, including even those holding very conservative positions, recognize that the implementation of such a policy is connected with considerable costs for capitalism itself. An example is D. Eisenhower (U.S. President from 1953 through 1961). While an opponent of communism and active defender of the class interests of U.S. ruling circles, he nonetheless understood that exorbitant expenditure on an atomic arms race and the militarization of the country could have dangerous social consequences for the United States. Eisenhower gave the significant warning: "The combination of a huge military organization and a vast military industry is a new phenomenon in the American experience. Its economic, political and even spiritual influence is being felt in each city, in the government of each state and in any office of the federal government.... It is essential that government authorities be on guard against the unwarranted influence which has been acquired, deliberately or not, of the military-industrial complex."

In diaries published posthumously Eisenhower expresses himself even more candidly. In 1954 he wrote: "We must not only not appease extreme reactionaries or appeal to their reason but ignore them and, if necessary, repudiate their views...."

For a characterization of Reagan and his associates it is fitting to quote K. Marx's pronouncement about politicians, who are their prototype to some extent. In Marx's time in politically backward Prussia bourgeois ideologists, groveling before the monarchy, sought and found arguments for the glorification of despotism. Back in 1842 K. Marx had held up to shame the provincialism and ignorance of these ideologists: "Ignorance is a demonic force, and we fear that it will serve as the cause of even more tragedies."*

* K. Marx and F. Engels, "Works," vol 1, p 112.

The period of the general crisis of capitalism is characterized by the appearance in the political arena of statesmen whose ignorance from the viewpoint of the danger of a world military catastrophe is without precedent. Back in 1955 the Einstein--Russell--Joliot-Curie Manifesto (the program document of the Pugwash movement) said: "It is essential to learn to think anew.... The question which we put to you is a severe, terrible and inevitable question: must we destroy mankind or should mankind renounce war.... Before us lies the path of uninterrupted progress, happiness, knowledge and wisdom. Will we choose, instead of this, death?"

The need to think anew is dictated by the realities of our era and the fundamental changes in the correlation of forces of the two social systems. This task confronts bourgeois political economy also. Despite its apologetic nature, changes are occurring in it brought about by a recognition of the need to defend the interests of capital itself, which is threatened by the adventurism of unchecked militarization.

The Confrontation of Schools in the Bourgeois Political Economy of Developed Capitalist Countries

An acute struggle of different schools and trends pertaining to cardinal problems of economic policy has unfolded in bourgeois political economy. To proceed from the reasoning of the contending parties, it might be thought that the stumbling block for them is the question of the role of the state in the economy. But this is not the heart of the matter.

Conservatives believe that the cause of the crisis of the mid-1970's-start of the 1980's was Keynesianism, which was embodied in social democratic reformism in West Europe and U.S. President F. Roosevelt's New Deal. The claim that Keynesianism, oriented toward social programs and fiscal policy providing for the redistribution of budget resources in favor of consumption, undermines incentives to capital investment, turning the state into a Robin Hood who takes from the rich to give to the poor.

Keynesians are indicted for the fact that it is precisely their policy which deceived the poor, having deprived the economy of growth incentives and given rise to stagflation and particular economic crises which have forfeited the traditional self-regulating mechanism of overcoming them. They are also accused of swelling the machinery of state, whose demoralization and corruption contribute to robbing the consumer, undermine the "labor morality" of the workers and ultimately bring about a "slide toward socialism," which is to the benefit only of the "reds".

But charges against J. Keynes that he was oriented toward consumption and ignored investments are completely groundless. Keynes concerned himself primarily and most with capital investments. He assigned the state the role of accomplice of private capitalist business merely in order to accelerate the emergence from the crisis, after which the neoclassical postulates concerning the "recovering impact" of market spontaneity take effect in economic policy. It was Keynes who proposed the prescription of "adjustable inflation," which makes it possible while preserving and even increasing nominal wages to achieve

the freezing of and an actual reduction in their actual amounts. Keynes and his followers at the same time, however, advocated the implementation of objectively progressive measures to increase the social budgets. These measures were dictated by the laws of class struggle, the victories of the workers movement in a situation of the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, the smashing of the most reactionary imperialist forces in World War II and the formation after it of the world socialist system.

Reagan's extensively proclaimed declarations concerning the need to free American business from the "stranglehold" of the state and the winding down of federal regulation do not signify a real lessening of federal intervention in the functioning of the U.S. economy. A certain reorientation of this intervention and a change in its methods and targets of influence are occurring. Federal revenues are being redistributed between consumption and savings in favor of savings and personal income in favor of the high-income strata with the aid of the government's economic policy.

Thus both the economic policy of conservatives and the economic policy of the Keynesians essentially represent two methods of state-monopoly regulation of the economy. The contradictions between their ideologists are not antagonistic. They do not preclude the possibility of synthesis and the development of an economic strategy employing elements of various concepts.

At the same time it would be wrong to underestimate the seriousness of the contradictions in the struggle for markets of nationally exclusive systems of state-monopoly capitalism and also not to draw distinctions between the strategy of their domestic and foreign economic policy. Account has to be taken of the increased role in the regulation of the world capitalist economy of such institutions as the IMF, the World Bank, GATT and other suprastate institutions mediating the movement of capital and commodities on a world scale and also the growing role of the exports of capital, which has become, as V.I. Lenin foresaw, a decisive form of economic relations under the conditions of imperialism.

The strategy of the reproduction of capital within the framework of the U.S. national market, which determines its place in the world capitalist system, has particular properties. Under the cover of social demogogy concerning the return of the United States to the moral values of the "American way of life" here the economic strategy of Reaganism is oriented by no means toward the market policy characteristic of its anticrisis regulation by Keynesian methods. The Reagan administration's economic strategy envisages the implementation of long-term programs of the transfer of the United States' production machinery to the basis of the science-intensive technology of the 21st century. The purpose of these programs is to secure the dominating positions of American imperialism in the economy of the capitalist world and create the military-economic potential which would guarantee American imperialism's world domination.

This strategy incorporates the use of economic crises and the unemployment they engender for a frontal offensive against the working people. Primarily to compel the working class "in the name of national interests" to abandon their demands for wage increases, curb the unions, limit their possibilities

in the organization of strikes and achieve the crudest barracks-type labor discipline. In a number of sectors the unions have succumbed to the diktat of the corporations at the time of collective bargaining.

The crisis of overproduction and the exacerbation of competitive struggle on the world capitalist market have helped knock down the rate of inflationary price rises in the main capitalist countries. However, this has not brought about the appearance of "healthy" trends and an "inclination toward investment," in Keynes' terminology. Inflation has contributed to the growth of parasitical forms of profit--the profits of stock exchange speculators and the owners of land and real estate--and also demand for a variety of treasures and luxury items, the prices of which continue to increase. In addition, the banks' high interest rates have made it more difficult for medium and small enterprises to obtain credit. The increased "morality" of such enterprises as a result of bankruptcies has contributed to the growth of the centralization and concentration of capital, the social polarization of society and an intensification of the class struggle.

The generous subsidies which the corporations receive from the state contribute to the exacerbation of class contradictions. They are granted in the form of huge tax-exempt depreciation allowances for the withdrawal of old-fashioned equipment which in many instances is physically perfectly suitable for use. Under the Reagan administration the laws of capitalist accumulation in the United States have found themselves to a greater extent than before protected by legal enactments whose violation is strictly punished judicially. This form of state intervention in the economy is a graphic example of Reaganism's demagogic concerning the liberation of the economy from the tutelage of the state and evidence of the further growth of monopoly capitalism into the state-monopoly, capitalist socialization of production accompanied by the monopolies' increased oppression of all society.

Monetarism--the theory of the "conservative counterrevolution" developed by M. Friedman, the head of the Chicago School--is employed extensively by the Reagan administration as an instrument of struggle against the revolutionary forces in the developing countries and also as a means of increasing the exploitation of the working people at TNC enterprises.

Apogetic bourgeois political economy, which has become a firm believer in the magic of the two-party system, attempts to prove that the growth of economic activeness which began in 1983 and the implementation of structural transformations based on the use of technology of the 21st century will ultimately lead to an easing of the contradictions within the United States and to a new degree of stabilization of capitalism.

A Marxist analysis of the prospects of the United States' social development refutes these short-sighted evaluations. Addressing delegates to the 23d Communist Party of the United States National Congress (November 1983), G. Hall, general secretary of the party, declared: "We have to deal with problems and forces which will determine whether there await us in the future war or peace, a nuclear arms race or disarmament. We are essentially faced with the most important question which human society has ever had to encounter: will this society make the qualitative leap forward along the path to socialism or a leap backward, to the abyss of nuclear devastation."

The main document adopted by the congress makes it incumbent upon the party to contribute to the mobilization of the people and to rally the peace-loving majority, which, it is believed, constitutes three-fourths of the population, in order to turn the United States onto the path of detente and disarmament.

As G. Hall said, "The events which have taken place in the economy represent a product of three separate, but interweaving, interconnected crises: the general crisis, structural crisis and periodic cyclical crisis." He observed that the structural crisis--a new phenomenon in economic life--"is the direct consequence of the fact that capitalism in the period of its decline and general crisis is unwilling or unable to adapt to the new level of technological development." As a result enterprises of the basic industrial sectors are being moved to areas where it is possible to pay low wages and obtain higher profits, and capital investments in the basic industrial sectors within the country are being cut back. "The light at the end of the tunnel of the structural crisis cannot be seen," such is G. Hall's conclusion.

It was emphasized at the congress that new features were manifested in the course of the election campaign reflecting important shifts in social consciousness--the growth of coalitions representing different detachments of working people, radical and ethnic minorities and other destitute strata of the population. Also in this category are the organizations of farmers, unemployed, women, youth and elderly people and the increasingly strengthening peace supporters movement. Influential religious groups, including the Catholic bishops and many supporters of Afro-American churches, have recently joined the anti-Reagan camp.

Programs of the Democratic Forces

The economic and political programs of the social democratic parties do not go beyond the framework of the doctrines of bourgeois political economy. They are linked directly with the traditions of bourgeois reformism, and this became particularly apparent after the declaration of the leaders of social democratic reformism that under current conditions K. Marx should be replaced by J. Keynes. But it would be wrong on these grounds to ignore or underestimate the progressive aspects of the economic programs of contemporary social democracy.

The program of the country's economic and social recovery adopted in 1981 by the government of forces of the left of France, which is headed by the socialists and of which the communists are a part, may serve as an example. This program represents a real alternative to the rightwing-conservative school in the theory and practice of state-monopoly regulation. The socialists claimed that the unemployment and economic stagnation inherent in contemporary capitalism may be overcome by means of the active policy of the state relying on the broad support of the nonmonopoly strata of the population.

Proceeding from the Keynesian idea of the creation of "additional demand," in 1982 the French Government consented to an increase in budget expenditure of more than 25 percent. Simultaneously taxation of the wealthiest categories of the population was increased, and there was a 25-percent increase in certain types of social benefits.

The government emphasizes the particular significance of the program of reforms which it has put forward, these being designed to create a new mechanism of the centralized regulation of the rate and proportions of economic growth based on nationalization and democratic planning. Although it has included the crisis "ailing" enterprises of ferrous metallurgy and chemistry, nationalization in France is oriented primarily toward the transfer to the state of a number of the biggest industrial groups occupying a monopoly position in new, dynamic sectors. The nationalized firms are called on to play the part of "strike" force of the economic upturn and "poles of growth". They are to pull into their orbit an increasingly large number of enterprises of the private sector, which remain an inalienable part of the country's economic structure. In other words, a model of a "mixed economy" is taking shape in France in which the market and state interventionism coexist.

However, neither the structural reforms nor the social policy of the government of the left do away with the private-monopoly structure of the economy and the preservation in the hands of monopoly capital of the dominating positions in the national economy. The bourgeois parties representing its interests are endeavoring to prevent realization of the "policy of change" planned by the government of the left.

In the hope of exacting revenge for the defeat at the May 1981 elections the bourgeois parties of the right are attempting to renew their theoretical concepts and the arsenal of ideological weapons. The traditional differences between the two leading bourgeois parties--the Rally for the Republic (RPR) and the Union for French Democracy--have been consigned to the background. The most aggressive force of the bourgeois opposition, which rejects everything that has been done by the government of the left, is the RPR headed by Mayor of Paris J. Chirac. The new RPR program (1983), which includes demands for the denationalization of the state sector, a reduction in social spending, expansion of the freedom of private enterprise and a limitation of trade union rights, is of a clearly expressed right-centrist nature.

The Communist Party, which is participating in the government of forces of the left, regards its activity in the bloc of the left as a certain stage of the class struggle laying the prerequisites for France's further democratic transformation. Championing the class interests of the working people, the French Communist Party (PCF) levels constructive criticism at certain positions of the government. France's turn toward Atlantism and subordination of the country's policy to NATO's military-strategic plans elicited the communists' sharp criticism. French communists proceed from the fact that only profound social transformations represent a basis for the long-term solution of the major problems confronting the country. PCF Secretary General G. Marchais declared in an interview with the journal LA REVOLUTION that the communists are emphatically opposed to the plans for the creation of a "military community of West European countries," which are contrary to France's national interests and represent a threat to peace. Touching on domestic policy problems, particularly the struggle against the continuing rise in unemployment and inflation, he observed that the PCF had put forward specific proposals aimed at surmounting the economic difficulties and would continue to actively contribute to the implementation of the joint program of the forces of the left.

The developing countries cannot be ignored when characterizing the struggle of trends and currents in economic science around the formulation of long-term strategy and the basic goals of economic policy. These countries are at the historical crossroads. Only a small number of them has embarked on the path of a socialist orientation, and the majority are still tied to the world capitalist economy by the historically evolved relations of the era of colonial domination, which cannot disappear immediately following the winning of political independence.

In countries of a capitalist orientation the national bourgeoisie is objectively faced with the need to orient itself toward a distinctive type of "mixed economy" which is intended to reorganize the one-sided single-crop structure of their economy. It is essential for this to do away with the dependence on foreign capital.

The sole dependable support for the developing countries' "mixed economies" is the creation of a state sector capable of being a lever of the cardinal reorganization of their economies. The specific feature of the economic programs of the national bourgeoisie of these countries is that this bourgeoisie, as distinct from its comprador strata, which have grown together with the foreign monopolies, striving for the growth of capitalism in depth and in breadth within their own states, is interested in the extirpation or, at least, a certain weakening of imperialist structures in the contemporary world economy exercising a policy of neocolonialism.

As an important factor of the accomplishment of the objectively progressive mission of surmounting family-tribal and feudal relations impeding the country's political consolidation and the development of its economy on the basis of expansion of the domestic market ("collective reliance on intrinsic forces"), the national bourgeoisie encounters the stubborn counteraction of imperialism which uses the "divide and rule" principle to provoke internecine family-tribal and religious wars facilitating interference in the country's internal affairs and the creation of military bases therein. In the 1970's the growth rate of the developing countries' economy was higher than in the industrial capitalist powers, in the 1980's it fell. Tremendous significance was attached in this connection to the problem of the paying off of debts, which increased the antagonistic contradictions between the "collective neocolonialism" of the former metropoles and the national liberation movement of their former colonies and semicolonies. The developing countries' total foreign debt has exceeded \$750 billion. Availing themselves of the disastrous position of the debtors, the IMF and the World Bank not only tightened the conditions for obtaining credit and new loans; they demanded that they pursue an economic policy in the spirit of the new neocolonizing postulates of Reaganomics. These include a wage freeze, reduced spending on social needs, an end to the subsidizing of state enterprises and an easing or the removal of control over the activity of the TNC. In fact it is a question of the dismantling of the structural elements of the "mixed economy" which manifested their objective anti-imperialist thrust and the national bourgeoisie's aspiration to strengthen its positions within the country. Thus at the annual IMF and World Bank session in October 1983 the voice of the developing countries remained a voice in the wilderness.

But their just demands could not be drowned out at the UN General Assembly 38th Session which was held at the same time in New York and which studied the tasks of international development strategy for the 1980's. The socialist community's support for the legitimate interests of the peoples of the emergent countries made itself known in full here. It is not fortuitous that broad social circles of the developing countries are turning their gaze to the Soviet Union and the other socialist states and displaying growing interest in Marxism-Leninism. Life has convinced them that the socialist countries were and always will be a reliable ally of the peoples of the developing countries in the struggle for economic justice and social progress.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/10

NATO, EEC FOREIGN POLICY ROLE, DIVERGENCE FROM U.S. POLICY

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNNYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6,
Jun 84 pp 27-38

[Article by V. Baranovskiy: "NATO and the EEC in Imperialism's Policy"]

[Text] A significant role in the development and implementation of the capitalist countries' foreign policy is performed by the North Atlantic alliance and the EEC. The activity of these two organizations exerts an appreciable influence on the state of world affairs, the alignment of forces within the imperialist camp and the nature of the relations between the states of the two opposite social systems.

Institutions of interimperialist cooperation--and NATO and the EEC occupy the leading place among them--are being used actively by reaction in its attempts to switch to a counteroffensive against the forces of peace and progress and to impart to the confrontation with the socialist countries a more large-scale, global nature. It was precisely with the help of the mechanism of the North Atlantic bloc that the United States was able to "organize" in Europe a new phase of the military-political confrontation, which was initiated by the deployment of American medium-range missiles on the territory of certain of Washington's NATO allies. The notorious "crusade against communism" announced by the R. Reagan administration presupposes the unification of all the West's forces in a "sacred struggle" against the socialist world.

Coordination of the actions of the developed capitalist countries is regarded by their ruling circles as a most important condition of effective opposition to world socialism. Also perfectly obvious is the intention of an attempt to organize the joint solution of the problems which in the current world situation have a high degree of priority for imperialism as a whole. A certain interaction of the Western countries has also been brought about by an endeavor to ease if only some of the contradictions which exist between them and mobilize the internal resources of the capitalist system for the purpose of ensuring its "normal" functioning.

Coordination of the actions of the developed capitalist countries and of individual components and directions of the political course pursued by them is effected in various organizational forms and via dozens of institutions of interimperialist cooperation which have arisen since the war. They include the OECD, the IMF, regular meetings of leaders of the "big seven," meetings of

foreign, economics and defense ministers and also such "informal" forums as the Bilderberg Club and the Trilateral Commission.

A particular part in this system is played by NATO and the EEC. They are the coordinating bodies in spheres of paramount significance for the states participating in the said organizations. Practically all the main developed capitalist countries (with the exception of Japan) are members thereof. It is precisely through NATO and the EEC that a significant part of the imperialist countries' foreign policy is implemented.

I

Following World War II, the United States found itself the unconditional leader of the West in the economic, political and military spheres; this predetermined Washington's dominating positions in the organizations of the capitalist states set up on its initiative. Particular hopes in the American capital were linked with the North Atlantic Treaty, which was signed in 1949. This country's ruling circles hoped that broad military-political organization set up under the aegis of the United States would afford it an opportunity to achieve the immediate accomplishment of two tasks: to ensure the more effective subordination of the West European partners and mobilize the West's aggregate potential for the military-political struggle against socialism. As far as the West European bourgeoisie was concerned, it saw NATO and the leading power of this bloc--the United States--as a guarantor of the permanency of the capitalist system.

Three basic, permanently preserved directions may be distinguished in the military-political activity of the North Atlantic alliance. First, the growth of the efforts of its participants and the organization of their joint actions in the military sphere; second, attempts to coordinate policy in other spheres which do not directly concern military questions but which are connected with relations between the states of the two social systems; and, third, coordination of policy with respect to situations which arise beyond the formal zone of operation of the North Atlantic Treaty, implementation of neocolonialist strategy in respect of the developing countries and suppression of the national liberation movement.

NATO activity in the said directions is subordinated to a single, global aim--the organization of extensive military-political confrontation with the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries. At the same time each of the bloc's participants aspires to ensure that the achievement of this goal not be detrimental to its specific interests. And inasmuch as the latter vary within quite broad limits the formation of NATO policy is a far from automatic process. While sharing the "philosophy" of the North Atlantic alliance as a whole, its participants frequently differ in the evaluation of their proposed recommendations concerning the desired line of conduct. Very acute disagreements arise in connection with practically every aspect of the bloc's activity. Nor is the sphere of direct military preparations an exception, although under the conditions of the exacerbated international situation and the development of the clamorous "Soviet military threat" campaign it is here that the efforts of the "Atlantists" aimed at strengthening "Western unity" are concentrated.

Let us take, for example, the problem of the deployment of the new American missiles on the territory of a number of West European countries, which began at the end of 1983. It is a question of an endeavor to change the military-strategic balance in Europe in favor of NATO. It was for this reason that the United States moved to frustrate the Geneva negotiations, initiating a new spurt of the arms race on the European continent. But the governments of the West European states which gave the go-ahead for the deployment of American missiles on their territory also assumed a considerable share of the responsibility for the increased East-West tension. At the same time even among them the attitude toward NATO's "twin decision" (at the official level included) was far from synonymous. The Danish Parliament declined to take part in financing the deployment of the missiles. The Greek Government proposed postponement of the deployment of the missiles. A debate concerning the so-called "dual key," which would give the British Government a guarantee that the United States would not use the missiles without its consent, was conducted in Great Britain literally on the eve of their deployment.

An understanding of the fact that the American (and NATO) doctrine of a "limited" nuclear war in Europe in fact converts the territory of Washington's allies into a lightning conductor designed to divert the danger of a retaliatory strike away from the United States itself is also becoming increasingly widespread. This fact is giving rise to differences between the United States and NATO's European participants concerning the practical meaning which should be invested in "ensuring the West's security". And this is creating grounds for serious conflicts within the North Atlantic bloc on questions of military strategy. The deployment of the American missiles not only cannot smooth over these conflicts but is raising them to a higher level.

A certain change in the very nature of the interdependence between the United States and West Europe in the military sphere is coming to fruition. Long a kind of axiom of the approach to questions of NATO strategy was the proposition that the bloc ensures "security" for West Europe inasmuch as it guarantees the use of the military potential of the United States, including its nuclear potential. With the achievement of strategic parity between the USSR and the United States doubts began to arise concerning the dependability of the American "nuclear guarantees". The West European NATO participants' confidence that the United States would be prepared to put its own territory under the threat of a retaliatory strike just for the sake of their "protection" wavered somewhat. Now some people are inclined to see the implementation of NATO's "twin decision" primarily as a means of "tying" the United States' strategic potential to the European theater. The presence of American medium-range missiles on the territory of the West European countries allegedly does not permit the United States "to dodge" a possible conflict in Europe. At the same time, however, the use of the "Eurostrategic weapons," according to such reasoning, should not entail massive retribution in respect of U.S. territory. This should also allegedly, keep a potential enemy--and the Soviet Union is considered such--from attacking West Europe.

But in reality NATO strategists are attempting with the arguments concerning "more dependable" guarantees to West Europe to conceal entirely different calculations. American hawks see the deployment of the "Euromissiles"

primarily as an opportunity to create a new threat to the Soviet Union, in proximity to whose borders there is to appear additional nuclear potential designed to strike military and other vitally important targets on its territory.* The admission contained in a report of the U.S. Congressional Research Service is significant: the American European-based missiles could be regarded as a component of American strategic power.**

In other words, Washington is using the new Pershings and cruise missiles not only to change the balance of forces on a European region scale but also to undermine strategic parity between the USSR and the United States. It is in fact a question of the use of West European territory for building up the strategic potential of the United States. For more than three decades it has been impressed upon West Europe that it "needs" the United States to ensure its security. Now, however, essentially elements of the reverse dependence are appearing: in its endeavor to achieve military superiority over the USSR the American leadership has to win the support of the West European NATO allies. But can Washington count on the fact that under the new conditions the allies will continue to be prepared to content themselves with the role of junior and obedient partner uncomplainingly carrying out the instructions of the transatlantic leader? After all, the nonconcurrence of interests in the sphere of ensuring security is creating grounds for serious contradictions on both sides of the Atlantic as it is.

Considerable disagreements arise among the bloc's participants on questions of the allocation of military spending also. The United States is endeavoring to shift the burden of the arms race onto its partners. A trend toward the increased contribution of the West European countries can be traced perfectly distinctly: whereas in 1970 they accounted for less than one-fourth of total NATO spending, they accounted in 1980 for 42 percent.

A considerable role in the increase in the West European states' material contribution to the North Atlantic alliance's military preparations has been performed by NATO's Eurogroup, which was set up in 1968 and which is made up of all the bloc's European participants (other than France and Iceland). From the very outset the United States regarded it primarily as an instrument of the mobilization of the financial resources of its West European partners. These calculations were justified to a certain extent. But at the same time features have begun to appear in the Eurogroup's activity which cannot fail to put Washington on the alert. First, the gradual formation of a specific West European system of military-economic, military-technical and military-industrial relations is under way which in a certain sense is contrary to the traditional U.S. leadership in the sphere of the development of arms for the North Atlantic bloc. For example, one of the biggest projects in NATO's history--the Anglo-Italian-West German program for the manufacture of the Tornado multipurpose fighter-bomber--is being undertaken without any significant participation by American military concerns. Second, the very increase in the financial, scientific-technical and production contribution of the West European countries

* See "U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Interim Report on Nuclear Weapons in Europe," Washington, December 1981, pp 14-16.

** See U.S.-Soviet Negotiations to Limit Intermediate-Range Nuclear Weapons". Congressional Research Service. Report No 82-136, July 23, 1982, p 4.

to the bloc's military efforts is imparting a more impressive nature to their political claims and making NATO's "European nucleus" a reality with which the United States already has to reckon. It is not, of course, a question of the emergence of some anti-American pole in the North Atlantic alliance and, even less, of an autonomous military-political structure independent of the United States. But certain changes are undoubtedly taking place in the system of "Atlantism," which is palpably beginning to affect American-West European relations.

Contradictions are also growing in NATO beyond the confines of the purely military sphere. West Europe, which is increasing its economic strength, is experiencing increasingly less a desire to obediently follow the lead of Washington's policy. And even the toughening of U.S. policy under the Reagan administration, although it has had a negative impact on the foreign policy of the bloc's West European participants, has not, nonetheless, been able to turn it completely into an antidependence channel. Significant in this respect was the reaction of the West European NATO participants to the attempt made by the White House in 1982 to extend to them the provisions of U.S. legislation concerning a limitation of trade-economic relations with the socialist countries. Such opposition to pressure exerted via NATO bodies is even becoming the norm on certain questions. This applies, in particular, to the notorious "sanctions" against the USSR. The question of their introduction was discussed at the NATO Council session in Brussels in September 1983. In spite of U.S. pressure, four states (France, Greece, Turkey and Spain) expressed serious reservations concerning the expediency of the "sanctions".

Primarily the contradictions between NATO participants on questions of economic mutual relations with the socialist countries were reflected here. This is a manifestation of the more profound process of the strengthening of centrifugal trends in the imperialist camp, which are expressed, *inter alia*, in West Europe's attempts to free itself from U.S. tutelage and to ease Washington's control over the foreign policy of NATO's European participants.

The American leadership is endeavoring to neutralize such trends, relying on the position of the bloc's leading military force, which the United States retains. In the period of detente Washington counted on getting its own way by way of broadening the competence of the North Atlantic alliance, extending its powers to nonmilitary activity and developing a joint line of conduct in the foreign economic, economic, social and other spheres. President R. Nixon called for this back in 1969, and H. Kissinger's 1973 proposal on "regulating" American-West German relations by way of the development of a "new Atlantic charter" was based on the same idea. But in West Europe the attempts to convert the NATO mechanism into a global coordinating body which would be controlled by the United States was given a very cool reception. This is why the U.S. Administration is proceeding toward its goal today by a different path. Spurring international tension, artificially fanning the "Soviet military threat" campaign and speeding up militarist preparations, Washington aspires to sharply raise on the scale of Western countries' political priorities the relative significance of the sphere in which it preserves the leading positions, namely, the military sphere. It thereby counts on perceptibly limiting the political maneuverability of its partners and their freedom of action.

The proposal concerning the creation of a nuclear-free zone in North Europe presented by Finland has been discussed for many years, for example. This idea has been actively supported by the Soviet Union. New impetus to the discussion on this question was imparted by a special report drawn up in 1983 by the Swedish Foreign Ministry. An obstacle in the way of realization of this idea is the "Atlantic status" of Denmark and Norway. Participation in NATO incorporates them in the zone of operation of the strategy developed by the bloc, which definitely envisages the possibility of the use of nuclear weapons in the event of a military conflict in Europe. The governments of the two countries are essentially faced with a dilemma: either to reconcile themselves to a limitation of their foreign policy independence, and on an issue, furthermore, which is of vital importance to them, or to seek for themselves "special conditions" in the West's military bloc. And Washington is objecting vigorously to the second option, using NATO mechanisms to put pressure on the Scandinavian partners.

The numerous conflicts between the North Atlantic bloc's participants are becoming a serious test of its firmness. At times they engender general political tension in NATO (we recall Franco-American relations in the 1960's), and sometimes the emergence of specific contentious issues leads to crisis development. Special coordination mechanisms have been set up to put an end to conflict situations or to reduce their seriousness. Back in 1956 a NATO Council session passed a resolution on the question of the peaceful settlement of disputes between the participants, and, what is more, the secretary general of the organization was officially entrusted with a mediation function.* But although the NATO bodies have managed, as a rule, to forestall the explosive development of events, they are, naturally, incapable of removing the contradictions at the basis of this intrabloc conflict or the other. For example, the Greek-Turkish disputes on the Cyprus question and in connection with the problem of the continental shelf in the Aegean, which have lasted many years now, impart an extremely acute nature to the relations of the two NATO states. Even the least signs of the preferential attitude of the bloc leadership toward one of the parties to the conflict gives rise on the part of the other to a highly pained reaction creating tension in the alliance.

Nor is the approach of the United States and the European NATO participants identical to the long-discussed problem of the expansion of the geographical zone to which the bloc's sphere of competence extends. Here also the principal initiator of such expansion is the United States, which would like to associate its partners in its interventionist actions in various parts of the world. However, the allies often prefer to operate more cautiously and are trying to dissociate themselves from the dubious, "not respectable" aspects of Washington's policy, particularly in the zone of the emergent countries (as was the case, for example, in connection with the U.S. aggression against Grenada). At the same time the ruling circles of the majority of West European states are endeavoring, like Washington, to prevent changes in the developing world unfavorable to imperialism. The possibility of an expansion of the alliance's

* See NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE, 15-16 December 1956.

"zone of operation" was announced officially for the first time in the summer of 1982 at the NATO Council session in Bonn at heads of state and government level. And the Western powers' behavior in connection with the events in Lebanon graphically testifies that the expansionist trends in NATO amount to more than just statements and declarations.

II

The economic and political realities of the West European power center of the imperialist camp are connected to a considerable extent with the continuing integration processes. In 1982 the EEC countries commemorated the "silver jubilee" of the Treaty of Rome. In a quarter of a century the Common Market has changed from the Six to the Ten, created a developed system of various bodies, passed through the "customs disarmament" stage and made a whole number of attempts to implement a coordinated economic and foreign policy.

The growing interdependence of the West European states and the similarity of the currency, energy, raw material and other problems facing them--all this is stimulating integration trends and the elaboration of a concerted economic policy. At the same time, however, this process is giving rise to specific contradictions. Thus France is endeavoring to protect the interests of its producers of agricultural products. Great Britain is seeking a change in the rules of the formation of the EEC budget since it considers its contributions to the Community treasury disproportionately high. The FRG is unwilling to play the part of main creditor of the Common Market. Italy is interested in a mobilization of resources for reducing regional disparities in economic development and pulling up the backward southern regions to the "average European" level. Denmark is concerned at the restriction of fishing areas in the coastal waters of other participants in the Community. Belgium and Luxembourg are counting with the help of measures implemented within the EEC on easing the crisis of their metallurgical industry. Greece is seeking "special status" in the Community inasmuch as it is difficult for it to compete with the stronger partners.

The EEC leaders are attempting to neutralize the contradictions and failures in the economic sphere by way of the active development of political integration and the intensification of political cooperation. It is sufficient to recall the Tindemans Report, which was drawn up in 1975, or the plan for institutional reforms prepared on the instructions of the heads of state and government of the European Community which appeared in 1979. A tradition even has been established: the more difficult progress in the economic sphere, the greater the emphasis the participants in the Community put on a variety of "political initiatives".

At the start of the current decade a most vigorous attempt to ensure the further politicization of the integration process was connected with the Genscher-Colombo Plan, which was named after the leaders of the foreign policy departments of the FRG and Italy. On the basis thereof a meeting of heads of state and government of the EEC countries held 17-19 June 1983 in Stuttgart adopted the "Solemn Declaration Concerning European Union". This is perhaps the most pretentious political document of the Community to have appeared

since the signing of the Treaty of Rome. To a certain extent it even prepares the public opinion of the Ten for the possibility of the appearance of a new treaty-legal basis of the integration association. The leaders of the European Community States announced that no later than 1988 they would reexamine the said declaration and decide "whether to reflect the successes which have been achieved in a treaty on a European union," which, it has to be assumed, would replace the Treaty of Rome. Meanwhile it is promised to conduct "extensive negotiations in order to tackle urgent problems of the Community and thereby create firm foundations for its further dynamic development through the end of this decade."

For the first time the Stuttgart declaration officially proclaimed that political cooperation between the participants in the Community is just as important a direction of the EEC's development as economic integration. Essentially it is a question of an attempt to impart an all-embracing nature to the integration process and lead it beyond the confines of the predominantly economic framework which were outlined by the Treaty of Rome. The decision to extend integration to the sphere of cultural cooperation and strive for unification of the rules of civil, commercial, criminal and procedural law calls for this, *inter alia*. A certain broadening of the competence of the European Parliament is envisaged also, although, it is true, on far from the scale proposed by the maximalist supporters of the Common Market's conversion into virtually a "United States of Europe".

The part which the European Community plays in the system of contemporary international relations is largely connected with the capacity of its participants for coordinating foreign policy. Since the start of the 1970's the Common Market countries have paid particular attention to the coordination of their international activity.

Questions of European and world politics are discussed at the thrice-yearly meetings of heads of state and government of the Ten and meetings of foreign ministers, which are convened regularly. The participants in the Community are endeavoring to demonstrate their capacity for "speaking with one voice" at the United Nations and other international forums and conferences. A whole series of agreements links the Common Market with the developing countries. And although originally the Community was oriented toward the development primarily of economic relations with the outside world, the political aspect in these mutual relations has occupied an increasingly impressive place in recent years. The negative reaction of official Common Market bodies to the U.S. Administration's attempts to torpedo the "gas-pipes" project not only reflects economic imperatives which are important for the West European countries but also their reluctance to be totally dependent on Washington in the sphere of relations with the socialist states. The Near East policy pursued by the European Community also testifies to the aspiration of its participants to perform a more independent political role in this region of importance to them.

The foreign policy activation of the European Community has become a quite noticeable phenomenon against the background of the complex and contradictory processes occurring in the world arena. It is endeavoring to strengthen its

positions as the nucleus of the West European center of imperialist rivalry in the competitive struggle with the United States and Japan. Further, it is attempting to strike a balance between loyalty to Washington and the policy of maintaining a political dialogue with the socialist states. Finally, the EEC wished to appear in the role of loyal partner of the developing countries.

A compromise position reflecting that which is common in the approach of the EEC participants to corresponding international problems is, as a rule, the result of the coordination effected within its framework. The search for such a "common denominator" also constitutes the essence of the process of foreign policy coordination itself. After all, the interests of different members of the association often do not coincide, and they are frequently competitors. Paris, for example, is interested in using the Common Market to strengthen its positions in Africa, while Rome is experiencing manifest disquiet in connection with the French intervention in Chad inasmuch as it prefers to maintain good relations with the countries of the North African region.

The foreign policy possibilities of the EEC states are also dissimilar. Having begun to develop the oil reserves of the North Sea, Great Britain has found itself less dependent on foreign sources of energy raw material than the other participants. This affords London the opportunity of pursuing a harder line in respect of the Arab oil-supplying countries.

When, however, the foreign policy of any EEC country does not "subscribe" to the line of conduct of the majority, additional collisions arise in the mutual relations between the partners. Attempts are made to put pressure on the dissident via this body of the community or the other, although the success of such pressure is by no means guaranteed. Speaking in September 1983 in the European Parliament, Greek Foreign Minister I. Haralambopoulos bluntly stated that entry into the EEC by no means signifies his country's consent to blindly follow the "common" policy of the Community in the international arena.

Thus it would be a manifest exaggeration to speak of the existence of some independent foreign policy "appearance" of the Community as such which is autonomous in respect of the foreign policy of the individual countries which constitute the EEC. It is sometimes capable of acting as a "character" in the international arena, a British expert writes, but it is far more often a question merely of attempts to "portray" unity.*

The question of the stimulation of foreign policy cooperation has been discussed in lively fashion in the EEC in recent years. An arrangement was arrived at the meeting of leaders of the Ten in Stuttgart on a broadening of consultations, the determination of common principles and purposes of behavior internationally, the European Community's broader representation in third countries at the diplomatic and administrative levels on the formulation of a joint position at international conferences. In the "Solemn Declaration" each participant undertook "to fully consider the positions of the partners" in the elaboration of its own foreign policy course.

Of course, all this is still very far from a "uniform foreign policy" which could come to replace "foreign policy individualism".

* See P. Taylor, "The Limits of European Integration," London, 1983, p 156.

III

Owing to the seriousness of the interimperialist contradictions, the developed capitalist countries have to seek forms of interaction in the international arena which enable them to smooth over their own differences and strengthen their positions with respect to the outside world. The sum total of the organizations, institutions and establishments created for this purpose may be regarded as the mechanism of imperialism's foreign policy. Both NATO and the EEC are among the most important components of this mechanism, each of which performs its own functions connected with the spheres of its predominant activity. The North Atlantic bloc was created primarily as an instrument of pressure on the socialist world. The emergence of the Common Market was also conditioned by certain political calculations, including the endeavor to create an effective "counterweight" to the socialist community; however, in this case an appreciable role was performed by the processes of the internationalization of the participants' economic life.

In the course of the formation of the imperialist powers' foreign policy NATO and the EEC participate in a certain "division of labor" in accordance with the specific features of the activity of each of these organizations. They complement one another in tackling tasks which are important from the viewpoint of the imperialist camp as a whole. Thus, for example, NATO concentrates efforts in the sphere of military preparations against the USSR and the other socialist community countries. The function, however, of spreading the West's influence to the zone of the developing countries is entrusted to the European Community with its ramified system of foreign economic relations.

The activity of NATO and the EEC in connection with the preparation and realization of the All-European Conference may serve as an example of their parallel efforts at the diplomacy level. The main body which determined the Western participants' approach to military-policy problems was the North Atlantic alliance, whereas the positions in respect of various aspects of cooperation along "East-West" lines were developed primarily by the European Community.

There is much that is common or similar in the activity of NATO and the EEC--by virtue of their homogeneous class nature. But the differences between them also appreciably influence their role in imperialism's foreign policy. Whereas the NATO bloc is intended to express the interests of two imperialist power centers, the EEC has become the political and economic nucleus of one of them--the West European. This expresses the fundamental contradiction of imperialism's foreign policy--between efforts to consolidate the Western countries and mutual competitive struggle.

The dominating role of the United States in NATO is converting this bloc into an instrument of Washington's policy. The influence of the United States on the European Community, however, is of a mediated nature. The United States' attitude toward the two organizations is not synonymous: it is interested in strengthening the North Atlantic alliance and building up with it its own might, whereas the strengthening of the positions of the EEC is causing it concern. The impact of the objectively conditioned contradictions between the two

imperialist centers on both organizations is also for this reason dissimilar. Developing within the NATO framework, American-West European contradictions are with reference to this bloc of an internal nature and create prerequisites for an undermining of the "unity" which the United States imposes on its allies. For the EEC, on the other hand, these contradictions are an external phenomenon which frequently lend impetus to the Western European countries' recognition of their own specific interests.

The adventurist policy of the Reagan administration with its gamble on force and the distinctly expressed inclination toward interventionism, which is causing serious concern in West Europe, is becoming an additional stimulus to foreign policy coordination in the EEC. "The Grenada events reminded us that there are times when Europe (West--V.B.) has to have an independent voice even in respect of its own closest allies. If we wish to be listened to, we must be in a position to exert a real influence on events. And we will be able to do this far more effectively if we act as the Ten and not as individual European states." These are the words of G. Howe, foreign secretary of Great Britain--a country which is among Washington's most loyal partners in West Europe.*

Washington is concerned to reduce to nothing the centrifugal trends in its partners' foreign policy. It is also attempting to influence the international-policy activity of the European Community on, for example, the question of a Near East settlement.

Whereas the West European countries can permit themselves a certain, albeit limited, economic and foreign policy independence, things are different in the military sphere. The military-policy sphere is essentially completely controlled by Washington, which is a constant reminder to its partners of their dependent position on the United States. True, this situation is coming to be recognized increasingly as an anachronism. Such sentiments are being underpinned by the increasing doubts concerning the dependability of the American "nuclear shield". "The senseless hope that within the alliance framework one of its members is prepared to put its existence at risk to protect the other participants cannot be the basis of a rational defense policy," a French military expert writes on this score.** It is this circumstance which is frequently the starting point of various plans providing for the ever increasing extension of West European integration to the military-policy sphere.

This idea is not new. It was formulated quite clearly in the Tindemans Report even: "The European union will remain incomplete until it has a common defense policy." It was specifically proposed that there be regular exchanges of opinions on military questions and that a "European arms agency" be set up.*** In June 1981 Tindemans was demanding on behalf of the Christian Democratic parties of the participants in the European Community the creation within its framework of a consultation mechanism on problems of "joint defense".

* THE GUARDIAN, 5 November 1983.

** M. Manel, "L'Europe des Etats sanctuarises" (DEFENSE NATIONALE, November 1983, p 50).

*** BULLETIN OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES, Supplement, January 1976, p 17.

The European Parliament, which is controlled by the rightwing majority, has also repeatedly presented similar appeals.

The traditional objection of the "orthodox Atlantists" to military integration within the EEC framework is connected with their fears for the fate of NATO: "Cooperation on defense issues within a European context would put the Atlantic alliance at risk."* This was once one of the reasons for the failure of the Fouché Plan put forward by France at the start of the 1960's, which provided for coordination in foreign policy and defense matters. But even today, as one who has studied this problem would have us believe, "no one is giving serious thought to the defense of Europe with its own forces: some people believe that in this case there would be too great an imbalance with the Soviet Union, others fear French domination and prefer a distant and strong patron to a small and close one and yet others fear primarily the development of West German military power. For this reason, despite the doubts concerning the American shield, adherence to Atlantism in the military sphere will continue to suit everyone."**

However, the thought is being expressed increasingly often even among the supporters of "Atlantism" concerning the need for a "reform" of the bloc which would enhance therein the role of the West European participants and permit the realization of a kind of "Europeanization" of NATO.*** H. Kissinger's article in a March issue of TIME magazine, in which he declared that "NATO's present-day structure simply does not function," elicited extensive comment on both sides of the Atlantic. Only one thing, in his words, can rectify the situation--"equalization" of the positions of the United States and West Europe in the military-policy sphere. The United States' allies, the former secretary of state believes, must "be forced to play a bigger part in providing for their own defense"; the political incentives to this could be, for example, a granting to them of the position of NATO supreme commander in Europe and a stimulation of their role at the negotiations on limiting and reducing arms--both conventional and nuclear.

Recently a pronounced place in the mutual relations between France and the FRG has been occupied by military--policy subject matter. This aspect was at the center of attention of top-level bilateral meetings in 1980, 1982, and 1983. As certain political observers believe, such cooperation between the two biggest continental powers could be the prerequisite of the formation of a West European military complex. Finally, the readiness of the EEC participants to "coordinate position on political and economic aspects of security" recorded in the above-mentioned Stuttgart Declaration could have serious consequences for the entire process of West European integration. True, it was declared at the same time that "military aspects and aspects of defense policy remain the business of the North Atlantic alliance." But addressing military problems was manifestly a step in the direction of a transformation of the EEC which could lead to the creation of "uniform defense"

* B. Burrows, G. Edwards, "The Defense of Western Europe," London, 1982, p 139.

** J. Huntzinger, "Europes," Paris, 1977, p 103.

*** See H. Bull, "European Self-Reliance and the Reform of NATO" (ATLANTIC QUARTERLY No 1, 1983, pp 25-43).

and the conversion of the Community also into a military alliance. Thus it is a question of new attempts to revive the idea of a European defense community, which failed three decades ago.

However, there is a number of circumstances counteracting these attempts. After all, it is a question of the EEC participants consenting to a considerable limitation of their sovereignty in this sphere, which is of fundamental significance for any state. French Foreign Minister C. Cheysson declared, not fortuitously: "The ten of us discussing defense plans is inconceivable."* A similar position was adopted by the Danish Government. Such a version of the development of integration is also unacceptable to Ireland, which officially adheres to a policy of neutrality and nonparticipation in military blocs. Many Western experts caution that "the inclusion of problems of ensuring security in the sphere of the activity of the European Community will inevitably change the evolved balance of forces therein."**

West Europe generally recognizes that the policy of enhancing the role of nuclear weapons in the global and European strategy of the United States and NATO is regarded by Washington primarily as a most reliable method of blocking the further development of centrifugal trends in American-West European relations and in the North Atlantic alliance. Reports even which incontestably testify that the entire clamor in connection with the "allies' confidence in the nuclear guarantees" of the transatlantic partner is deliberately exaggerated primarily by the United States itself reach the press from time to time. The deployment of the new American medium-range nuclear missiles in West Europe which has begun is aimed at cementing the NATO bloc and the even greater attachment of its West European participants to Washington's policy.

There is no doubt that such a policy, particularly in the long term, will cause the growing irritation of the United States' NATO partners, who cannot fail to understand that it threatens their security and sovereignty and is inseparable from the policy of the United States' economic and financial pressure on the EEC as a whole and individual West European countries. Nor can it fail to be seen there that this policy, which is pursued via the channels and mechanisms of NATO, where the dominant positions are occupied by the United States, by no means contributes to the solution of West European problems proper and the promotion of mutual relations within the Ten but in certain cases impedes such a solution even. It was not fortuitous that Washington's attempts to turn the EEC into something like an economic appendage of NATO in Europe have failed.

The dangerous actions of the United States and the objective manifestations of the intensifying interimperialist contradictions are forcing many people in the capitals of the West European countries to ponder increasingly the true place of their region in European and world politics and really dependable paths of securing their vitally important interests.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984

8850

CSO: 1816/10

* LES ECHOS, 30 November 1981.

** JOURNAL OF COMMON MARKET STUDIES, September-December, 1982, p 243.

SOCIAL DISRUPTION OF WESTERN MICROELECTRONICS BOOM EXAMINED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNNYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6,
Jun 84 pp 39-52

[N. Ivanov article: "Socioeconomic Consequences of the Mass Application of Microelectronics"]

[Text] As of the mid-1970's the capitalist countries embarked on a new stage of the scientific-technical revolution connected with progress in the sphere of microelectronics. The development of the production forces which it has caused is taking place under the conditions of the deepening of the socioeconomic contradictions of capitalism. This is being expressed in the increased frequency of the cyclical overproduction crises, which are combined with the long-term structural crisis which has embraced the basic spheres of the capitalist economy, in the decline in the rate of growth of GNP and in the decline in employment and the increase in unemployment, which has become one of the most acute problems of bourgeois society.

Monopoly capital sees the way out of the crisis phenomena in the broader use of the achievements of scientific-technical progress and the reorganization of the economy on the basis of the introduction of microelectronics. However, this is causing a further exacerbation of the socioeconomic contradictions of capitalism inasmuch as the monopolies' use of the latest achievements of the scientific-technical revolution is subordinated to the previous main goal--profit maximization. At the same time, however, a deformation of the technical development itself of the capitalist states is being observed: it is being subordinated to an increasingly great extent to the interests of the military-industrial complex to the detriment of the civilian sector.

Essence and Basic Directions of the 'Microprocessor Revolution'

The appearance and practical application of microelectronic logic units--microprocessors--are the basis of the changes which are occurring in the nature of the production forces. They represent miniature computers operating on the basis of integrated circuits which have been recorded on silicon or germanium chips of a size of several square millimeters. Each of them contains hundreds of thousands of elements, which replace the transistors and diodes of previous circuits. And, furthermore, the miniaturization process continues: whereas the integrated circuits being manufactured at present contain 250,000 elements, by the end of the 1980's the appearance of nanoprocessors using

1,000 times more complex integrated circuits is expected. The creation of 1 million times more powerful picoprocessors operating at the molecular level is possible in the future.

The miniature dimensions, low cost and functional all-purpose nature have made possible the extensive application of microprocessors in various spheres of the economy. The impact of the "microprocessor revolution" is most perceptible in industry. In the United States, for example, the number of microprocessors employed here increased from 77 to 445,000 in the period 1977-1980 and, according to forecasts, will have passed 3 million by 1985.¹ Considerable progress has also been made currently in computerization of the sphere of finance and services. In particular, by 1979 in West Europe machines had replaced 22 percent of bank employee-cashiers. The use of machines for recording checks in such countries as the United States and Japan has assumed even greater proportions. The United States had over 38,000 of them in 1982.² The system of credit cards and electronic accounts has become widespread, and electronic archives and data banks are being set up. Microelectronic equipment is also revealing big prospects in the sphere of automation of office work.

In the material production sphere the development of the "microprocessor revolution" is proceeding mainly in the direction of the creation of increasingly modern robots and flexible production systems (FPS), the numbers of which are growing rapidly in all the industrially developed capitalist countries. The OECD estimates thus the dynamics of the numbers of industrial robots in the capitalist countries in the period 1974-1982.³

Table 1. Number of Robots

	<u>1974</u>	<u>1982</u>
Japan	1,500	13,000
United States	1,200	6,250
FRG	130	3,500
Sweden	85	1,300
Great Britain	50	1,152
France	30	950
Italy	90	790

Source: THE OECD OBSERVER, July 1983, p 12.

As can be seen from the table, the leading position in the sphere of robotization is occupied by Japan, which has far outdistanced the other capitalist countries. And this gap is even greater, what is more, if we count simple manipulators, of which there are several tens of thousands at Japanese enterprises.⁴

As far as the FPS is concerned, it represents an automated production area incorporating a system of robots, special conveying and loading for the consistent supply of intermediate products from one robot to another and a computer, which ensures control of the production process and quality control.

The FPS operates automatically 24 hours a day and is making it possible to increase labor productivity hundreds of times over. Thus a new plant of the Japanese (Yamadzaki) Machinery firm specializing in the production of machine-tool parts with digital program control [DPC] in the city of Nagoi, where FPS have been installed, has a personnel strength of just 12 and produces in 3 days as much as 215 persons produced using conventional equipment in 3 months.⁵ A no less important distinguishing feature of the FPS is, as follows from its very name, the possibility of the rapid changeover of the equipment for the manufacture of new types of product, which ensures a sharp increase in the maneuverability of industrial production.

Another promising direction of the development of the production forces connected with progress in the sphere of microelectronics is the creation on the basis thereof by way of the combination of microprocessors with telecommunications systems and machinery of automated systems of the control of continuous production processes and quality control. They make it possible not only to automate traditional production engineering operations and accelerate their fulfillment but to switch to the use of fundamentally new technologies--biotechnology and laser technology. The creation of automated control systems is thereby revealing broad prospects of technical progress.

The mass introduction of microprocessors and automated equipment operating on the basis thereof is intensifying the process of structural changes in industry--new sectors connected with the production of microelectronics and also commodities containing microelectronic components are appearing. It is sufficient to say that the total production of information equipment in the United States, Japan and West Europe doubles every 5 years. According to specialists' estimates, by 1986 some 50 percent of the metal-working equipment produced in the United States will consist of robots and machine tools with digital program control.⁶

As a result of the changes occurring in the technical base and structure of modern production the overall production potential of the industrially developed capitalist states is increasing considerably. The national framework is proving too narrow for the increased industrial capacity, which is leading to an exacerbation of competitive struggle on the sales market and the intensification of interimperialist rivalry and bourgeois states' intervention in world economic relations.

Competition on the integrated circuit market is particularly acute. As is known, American firms embarked on their production earlier than others. In 1970 the Intel company manufactured the first consignment of 1K integrated circuits (K equals 1,000 microelements per silicon chip). However, with the appearance of more sophisticated integrated circuits first place in this form of production was snatched by Japanese firms. In 1983 Japan accounted for more than 70 percent of the total sale of 64K circuits. The production of integrated circuits has now risen to a new qualitative level. Class-256K circuits, with which American firms are hoping to gain victory over their Japanese competitors, have appeared on the market.⁷

Progress in the sphere of microelectronics is accelerating considerably the process of the internationalization of production and capital. This is connected with the fact that the dominating position on the microelectronic equipment market is occupied by several of the biggest transnational corporations [TNC]: the American IBM, Texas Instruments, Motorola, Intel and National Semiconductor, the Japanese Nippon (Denki) and Hitachi and the Dutch Phillips. They are making active use of the advantages of international specialization and cooperation to reduce costs and increase production efficiency. While the research and design base, software and the production of integrated circuits and complex equipment (computers, robots and so forth) is concentrated in the countries which house the headquarters of the TNC, the manufacture of household electronics and other relatively simple types of product is being moved abroad, mainly to the developing countries.

This structure of the international division of labor in the sphere of the production of microelectronic equipment is not only consolidating the monopoly position of the biggest TNC on the world market of a given product but also leading to the increased dependence of countries of a middle level of capitalist development and, particularly, the developing states on the main producers of microelectronics--primarily the United States and Japan. And, furthermore, it is a question of dependence in both the economic and military-policy respects. The latter is conditioned by the fact that modern military equipment is based on microelectronics, which is a most important component of missile-guidance, detection, control, communications and data analysis and processing systems.

The 'Microprocessor Revolution' and the Situation in the Employment Sphere

What are the social consequences of the "microprocessor revolution" under the conditions of capitalism? First of all, how is it influencing the situation in the employment sphere? These and similar questions are now the subject of extensive discussion in the Western press and specialized scientific literature, in the course of which different and sometimes opposite viewpoints are expressed.

For example, according to (Dzh. Dibold), the well-known American specialist in the sphere of labor relations, the present stage of the development of automation based on microelectronics is being accompanied by the usual structural reorganization in the manpower market and, consequently, there is no reason to expect a dramatic reduction in employment. Prof V. (Leont'yev), winner of the Nobel Prize, believes, on the contrary, that the mass introduction of microelectronics, which will assume the performance of an increasingly broad range of the functions of workers of both physical and mental work, will lead in the future to man's almost complete ouster from production.⁸

As we can see, bourgeois specialists essentially reduce the problem of the impact of the new stage of automation on employment to the question of whether the introduction of automated equipment will bring about a progressive reduction in the demand for manpower or whether it will be a question merely of a change in the structure of the demand. It is not, however, a question of the technology itself. The social consequences of its application will depend on the specific

conditions of the socioeconomic system. The essence of the problem is that the new production forces under capitalism are coming into conflict with the narrow framework of capitalist production relations. This is being manifested in the growing discrepancy between the increase in the productivity of the equipment and the trend toward a reduction in the production growth rate.

A basic incentive for the monopolies' introduction of robots, FPS and other types of labor-saving equipment based on microelectronics is the sharp exacerbation of the competitive struggle on the sales markets under the conditions of the general reduction in the economic growth rate. The extensive application of microelectronics is making it possible to reduce overall production costs considerably, primarily thanks to a reduction in expenditure on manpower, and thereby raise the competitiveness of the commodities. A kind of feedback has emerged: the development of microelectronics and its mass use in production is exacerbating competition on the sales markets, while the latter circumstance is, in turn, stimulating the accelerated introduction of microelectronics in production.

The prevailing conviction in the business circles of the industrially developed capitalist countries is that the reorganization of production on the basis of microelectronic equipment is the sole acceptable strategy for survival under the conditions of the toughening of the struggle for sales markets.

This idea has served as the basis for policy in the sphere of labor relations pursued by the capitalist states' ruling circles. It is a question of attempts by employers on the pretext of an increase in the competitiveness of the products to impose on the workers and employees the idea of the "cooperation" of labor and capital in the retooling of production, which ends for the working people in a reduction in personnel and the intensification of the labor of those who still have a job. The maximum identification of the working people with the fate and interests of the firm is propagandized as the sole alternative to mass dismissals.

In reality, however, the increased exploitation of the work force under the conditions of the accelerated automation of production by no means lessens the threat of mass dismissals either on the scale of individual firms or within the framework of the entire economy and, even less, the world capitalist economy as a whole. It is only possible to speak of the temporary advantages of individual companies or countries which have squeezed out their rivals in the struggle for sales markets and expanded production thanks to the ruin of competitors.

The example of Japan is typical in this respect. Using a high degree of automation of production in combination with the relatively lower level of wages and a considerably longer work week compared with the other industrially developed capitalist countries, Japanese corporations have scored significant successes in the competitive struggle on the world market, having considerably superseded their American and West European partners. This, in turn, was a most important reason in the 1970's Japan's economic growth rate was far higher than the corresponding indicators for the United States and the West European states.

Under the conditions of the relatively rapid development of the economy the introduction of microelectronic equipment did not initially cause mass dismissals of workers and employees. In the 1980's the situation is beginning to change. The reduction in the economic growth rate on the one hand and the expanded scale of the use of microelectronic equipment on the other have already led to a serious deterioration in the situation in the employment sphere. According to estimates of the Association of Japanese Trade Unions, SOHYO, the level of unemployment in the country will rise in the 1980's from 2.2 percent at the start of 1982 to 12 percent by the end of the present decade.⁹

In analyzing the impact of the present stage of automation on the labor market it must be borne in mind that as of the present this process has affected a comparatively small sector of industry and the services sphere even in the most developed capitalist countries, and for this reason the unfavorable consequences of the "microprocessor revolution" in the sphere of employment are as yet being manifested comparatively feebly. It is sufficient to say that, despite the rapid growth in the fleet of robots, at the start of the 1980's there were from several hundred to several thousand workers and employees per multipurpose automatic manipulator (see Table 2).

Table 2. Number of Robots Per 10,000 Persons Employed in Processing Industry

<u>Country</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1981</u>
Sweden	1.3	29.9
Japan	1.9	13
FRG	0.4	4.6
United States	0.8	4
France	0.1	1.9
Great Britain	0.1	1.2

Source: THE OECD OBSERVER, July 1983, p 13.

If it is considered that each robot replaces on average from 3 to 5 workers, it may be concluded that the process of robotization has basically affected less than 1 percent of jobs in industry.

The main factor holding back the more widespread application of robots in industry is their relatively high cost compared with the costs per work place. However, as the production of robot equipment increases and is standardized and also as microprocessors become cheaper, the cost of automatic manipulators will come down. Thus the ratio of annual costs per work place in industry and the price of a robot in Japan was reduced from 1:10.5 in 1971 to 1:3.4 in 1979. Another factor contributing to the increasingly widespread introduction of robot equipment is the increase in its productivity and all-purpose nature: equipping automatic manipulators with sensor mechanisms makes it possible to use them in the performance of a broader range of operations, primarily in assembly. As a result there is an increase in the economic efficiency of the use of robot equipment, which predetermines in the future a further increase in the pool of robots in the industrially developed capitalist countries.

According to a forecast of specialists of the Illinois Institute of Technology, in 1985 the number of industrial robots in the United States will have risen to 17,000 and by 1990 to 100,000-115,000. The leaders of American companies producing robots predict a growth in the pool of robots to 135,000-150,000 even.¹⁰

Under the conditions of low production growth rate robotization on such a scale signifies a real threat to millions of working people. The question arises: is there a possibility that the reduction in employment as a result of automation will be compensated by the creation of new jobs in the sectors connected with the production and servicing of microelectronic technology and equipment, as certain bourgeois specialists believe? If we proceed from present trends, there are no grounds for optimism.

Microelectronics is playing an important part in the process of so-called "re-industrialization"--the structural reorganization occurring in the industry of the developed capitalist countries. It has been brought about by the appearance and development of new sectors connected with the most promising directions of scientific-technical progress and the winding down of a number of traditional works for whose product there is declining demand.

The production of computers and other types of electronic equipment, instrument making, the rocket-space industry and pharmaceuticals stand out among the new sectors. By virtue of the high science- and capital-intensive nature of these sectors, the rapid growth of production here is not being accompanied by a significant increase in the number of jobs. According to the estimates of American specialists, in 1983 the high-technology sectors in the United States employed approximately 3 million persons, which constitutes almost 3 percent of the total work force (excluding agriculture). By 1993 total production here will have increased 87 percent, but the growth of employment will constitute only 29 percent. As a result jobs in the high-technology sectors will account for no more than 4 percent of all jobs in the economy.¹¹

In contrast to the technically progressive sectors of industry the "old" sectors like the metallurgical, textile, shipbuilding and certain others are in a state of depression. There has been virtually no growth or a decline even in their production for a long time. Endeavoring to reduce production costs and increase the competitiveness of the product, the employers are intensively introducing labor-saving equipment. Inasmuch as a considerable proportion of workers and employees is employed in the depressed sectors the process of "re-industrialization" is entailing an appreciable reduction in jobs in industry.

Certain Western economists are of the opinion that the reduction in employment in material production connected with the development of the new stage of automation could be compensated by an increase in the number of jobs in the services sphere or in the "tertiary sector". As is known, since the war overall employment has grown mainly thanks to an expansion of this sphere, and from one-half to two-thirds of the economically active population is currently concentrated in the "tertiary sector" in the industrially developed countries. Can it be hoped, considering this fact, that the services sphere will continue to absorb the manpower squeezed out of material production and that the employment problem will solve itself?

Such hopes are groundless. First, labor-saving equipment is being introduced increasingly actively in trade, transport, communications, state administration and also in the sphere of finance, health care and education. The computerization of offices and the introduction of a system of electronic accounts in banks could lead to a 30-40 percent reduction in employees in the immediate future even.¹²

According to the estimates of American specialists, the continued introduction of microelectronic equipment will affect the sphere of brain work to a far greater extent than that of physical labor. They believe that in the next 20 years 6.9 million jobs in production directly and approximately 38 million jobs in the sphere of management and data processing (including 10 million office workers, 9 million managers, 5 million persons of auxiliary administrative personnel and 14 million specialists) will face the threat of reorganization or reduction.¹³

Second, there are certain limits to the expansion of the services sphere under capitalist conditions. Whereas the population's need for service could be increased without limit, its satisfaction is limited by effective demand. Ultimately this depends on the amount of the real income of the working people, who constitute the absolute majority of the population. Yet the reduction in outlays on manpower in connection with the use of labor-saving microelectronic equipment will have a braking impact on the growth of the aggregate wage, which will exert a negative influence on the development of effective demand. The increase in the relative significance of those employed in the services sphere here at the expense of the reduction in the proportion of those employed in material production will brake the rise in the overall real wage level inasmuch as the average wage level in the "tertiary sector" is approximately only half as much as in the material production sphere.

It cannot be said that Western specialists have entirely disregarded these factors. There is an increasing lack of confidence among them in the capacity of the market mechanism for automatically solving problems of employment under the conditions of the "microelectronic revolution". Appeals are being heard for the elaboration of a new policy in the sphere of regulation of the labor market. Particular hopes are being put in a considerable reduction in work time.¹⁴

Typical in this respect is the work of A. (Cherns) (Great Britain), who believes that it is essential for values to be reassessed when studying problems of employment and unemployment in modern society. Inasmuch as microprocessors are releasing man from long daily work the latter should not be regarded as the norm and an essential condition of the functioning of the economy. Other values, (Cherns) writes, are moving to the forefront, primarily free time, as in the times of the Athens Republic.¹⁵

The utopian nature of this position is obvious: an indispensable condition of the release of the working people's masses from long daily labor is removal of the need to sell their manpower, on which capitalist production relations are based. As long as this alienation continues, wage labor will not change its nature, and its duration will be determined not only by the level of social labor productivity but also by the exploitation norm.

Microelectronics and the Change in the Nature of Labor Functions

A further, no less acute social problem--the impact of microelectronics on the change in the content of labor and man's position in the process thereof--is closely connected with employment. Its urgency is increasing as the use of this type of equipment expands. In the estimation of specialists, in two decades approximately 45 million jobs will be directly connected with microelectronics in the United States. What will be man's position in a world of robots and automated information systems? Will he become an appendage of microelectronic equipment or its master--such questions are being discussed increasingly extensively in the Western press.

Two opposite viewpoints can be traced here: some experts are inclined to idealize the role of microelectronic equipment as a factor of the humanization of labor, others, on the contrary, discern in it the danger of its dehumanization. However, both accentuate attention on the possibilities of the equipment itself and not on the socioeconomic conditions of its use.

In reality modern microprocessor equipment possesses unprecedented opportunities for influence in both directions. The entire point being how and for what purpose it is used. With the appearance of computers, which assumed some of the functions of management and control, a fundamentally new system arose: man--machine. The nature of the functions performed by man depends on whether he is a passive element of this system entirely subordinated to its control or can actively influence it, adopting creative decisions and exercising overall control.

Within the framework of the capitalist firm organizational forms have developed in recent years predominantly along the lines of increased centralization. This is being manifested particularly noticeably in the course of office automation. Having surveyed this process in the United States, the American sociologists E. Glenn and R. Feldberg discovered that automation had not led to an increase in elements of independence and a reduction in fragmentary functions in office work. Machine-maintenance requirements are coming to replace management's general indications. The possibility of the employee himself, however, influencing the procedure of the performance of operations or making changes to them is highly negligible.¹⁶ The group of systems analysis specialists, programmers and electronics engineers, whose work functions are of a creative nature, constitute an exception.

Even more contradictory is the impact of automation on the content of labor functions and the skills level of the workers employed in industry. For example, a fundamental study in this sphere conducted jointly by specialists from Britain, Holland, Canada, France and the FRG at the start of the 1970's concluded that the introduction of automated equipment would lead to an increase in the role of the worker in the production process, with which would be connected an increase in his responsibility, skills level and participation in technical decision-making.¹⁷ A different conclusion is reached by the authors of a report published by the Japanese Committee for Study of the Impact of Microelectronics on Employment: in their opinion, equipment created on the basis of microprocessors will make it possible to

simplify operations considerably and, thanks to this, replace skilled workers with unskilled workers.¹⁸

The contrast of the evaluations testifies that the impact of microelectronics on qualifications is not straightforward: much depends on the specific forms of its use and on the system of labor organization. A real opportunity is being created for the first time for automating all production operations--from the loading of the raw material through the dispatch of the finished product--not only in sectors with a continuous production process (petrochemistry, power engineering) but also in sectors with a traditionally discrete type of production. Under these conditions there remains to man the functions of planning and designing, the installation, adjustment and maintenance of equipment, overall control and also the reorganization of production on new schedules and the manufacture of new types of product. Thus the FPS is serviced by teams of highly skilled engineers, technicians and workers and specialists in the sphere of mechatronics (the synthesis of microelectronics and mechanics), who undertake the installation, adjustment and change in the work programs of the FPS.

In the use of robots the main volume of labor input is connected with their installation, adjustment and regulation and software. This is increasing the proportion of highly skilled maintenance personnel and programmers and considerably reducing the relative significance in the total number of those employed of operational workers (semiskilled, in the main), who are being replaced by robots. As a result the application of robots is leading to an appreciable change in the skills structure of workers at enterprises. In the estimation of L. Vickery, member of the board of directors of the American General Motors corporation, currently the ratio of the numbers of skilled workers to semiskilled employed basically on the production line is 1:5.6, but the program of the mass introduction of robots at the corporation's plants will change this ratio to 1:1.¹⁹

As yet, however, robots and, even more, FPS constitute only a small part of production engineering equipment which is in use. The level of automation even in the most developed capitalist countries is far from present-day technical potential. The most prevalent form of the use of microelectronics is partial automation: the use of microelectronic apparatus for automated quality control, the use of machine tools with digital program control and so forth.

Under the conditions of partial forms of automation man remains included in the production process. The breadth and content of his labor functions here are largely conditioned by the forms of labor organization. The close dependence of the amount of the demands made on the workers' skills on the organization of labor is emphasized in the material of a seminar which was organized in February 1982 in Rome by the European Center for the Study of Problems of Labor and Society.

The summary reports of the seminar distinguish two extreme types of organization of the labor of workers using machine tools with DPC.²⁰ The first is when programming and the compilation of a process chart of the machine tools'

operating schedule are catered for by a team leader or foreman and the operator's functions include merely the loading of the machine tool with the intermediate products, observance of its operation and removal of the finished product, while quality control is exercised by the foreman.

The second is when all the above-listed functions, including programming, adjustment, the optimization and amendment of the programs and, finally, quality control, are transferred to the operator. It is clear that the second type of organization makes considerably higher demands on an operator's qualifications.

Two contradictory trends in the organization of labor may be noted: endeavoring to use low-income manpower, an administration uses microelectronics to simplify labor operations and narrow the workers' functions where possible without detriment to production. At the same time, however, increasingly great significance for the firm's success in the competitive struggle is attached to skilled workers of a broad profile who are capable of providing for the maintenance of complex automated units and rapidly mastering new equipment.

The interaction of these trends is increasing the process of the polarization of skills in the capitalist countries. On the one hand categories of workers possessing broad-profile skills and close in the volume of technical knowledge to the level of secondary technical specialists are distinguished. On the other, the artificial parceling out of labor functions and the existence of a considerable proportion of workers with narrowly specialized professional knowledge and skills.

We cannot simplify the process of such polarization, reducing it to an increase in the qualifications of one part of the workers and the dequalification of the other. It is proceeding on an appreciably new technical basis. The current stage of automation based on microelectronics is changing many parameters of qualifications. A change in the content and volume of necessary professional knowledge and skills is occurring primarily. For example, a worker performing even narrowly specialized functions when servicing a machine tool with DPC must have, besides the usual knowledge in the sphere of metal working, a certain minimum of ideas concerning electronics and programming, which presupposes a relatively high level of general development and general educational training.

Further, the content of labor, in which increasingly great significance is attached to observance of the readings of the instruments and immediate response to changes in these readings, is changing. Whence the reduction in the muscular and increase in the nervous-mental load. The application of costly automated equipment, which is sharply accelerating the overall rhythm of the production process, given an increase in the interdependence between individual production operations and areas, demands of the worker general technical culture and knowledge not only of his own narrow functions but also ideas concerning the entire production chain enabling him to foresee possible malfunctions. There are also increased demands on self-discipline, precision, rapidity of response and a capacity for quickly mastering new equipment.

American experts in the sphere of the use of microelectronic equipment in production are noting considerable changes occurring in the content of labor and the workers' skills. There is a lessening of the demands made on manual labor skills, the physical load is declining and certain traditional professional knowledge is becoming obsolete. At the same time, however, demands on the amount of general educational knowledge, precision performance of operations and the capacity for rapidly apprehending what is new are growing. As a result the content of the qualifications is undergoing such changes that the level thereof in workers connected with work on old equipment and in workers servicing microprocessor equipment is becoming increasingly less comparable.

Nonetheless, as a whole, in line with the continued introduction of microelectronic equipment, the overall level of workers' vocational training is rising, which, however, is far from always recorded in wage rates and collective contracts at the enterprises. The administration of firms determines skills categories basically depending on the duration of the period of essential professional training--the longer the period, the higher the qualifications. New parameters of measurement--level of general education and culture, self-discipline, performance precision, rapidity of response, responsiveness to what is new, adaptation to changing conditions--are not always taken into consideration.

Workers have a direct interest in acquiring modern technical knowledge and mastering skills of a broad profile corresponding to the objective demands of the current stage of scientific-technical progress. All this is ensuring the rapid adaptation of the work force in respect of the changing conditions on the labor market and increased mobility, which is reducing its dependence on the whims of the market. Further, a broader skills profile affords opportunities for continuous professional growth, which is a guarantee against knowledge and skills becoming antiquated. Finally, the expansion of labor functions and an increase in skills are closely connected with the struggle for production democracy and worker control at the enterprises and an increase in the worker's role in modern production and the development of technical progress, which, in turn, is strengthening the class positions of the proletariat in the struggle against the power of capital.

Information Science and the Individual

A most urgent aspect of the social consequences of the "microelectronics revolution" is its impact on the position of the individual in society. Some bourgeois theorists are characterized by the absolutization of the possibilities of information technology in the sphere of the social reorganization and comprehensive development of the personality. Relying on the well-known "postindustrial society" theory, they have put forward the idea of the "information society".²¹ Its essence is that microelectronics is creating a fundamentally new basis of the development of the economy--the production of information is moving to the forefront, superseding material production. The scale of values is changing: intellectual values are gaining priority over material values, which signifies the end of the "consumer society" with its contradictions and lack of spirituality. The intellectual blossoming of the personality should be the result.

Western sociologists and futurologists claim that the "information society," ensuring access to data banks for the broadest circles of the population, will contribute to alleviating social contradictions. According to a forecast of the American sociologist B. (Kornish), by 1990 approximately 80 percent of American homes will have a home microcomputer.²² Another American sociologist, A. Toffler, believes that as a result of the "microelectronic revolution" the traditional organizational forms of labor of the industrial society--plants, offices, banks--where tens of thousands of workers and employees are concentrated--will disappear. They will be replaced by work in the home with the aid of a home computer switched in to a centralized data bank.

Microelectronic equipment does really afford opportunities for a certain decentralization of production, including the organization of small-scale "family" enterprises. However, under the conditions of the modern capitalist market they can exist only under the control of and in total dependence on the big firms, fulfilling orders for them in accordance with subcontracts. The ideas idealizing the "information society" are being abstracted from the actual reality of capitalism--the domination of monopoly capital and the bourgeois state in the sphere of information science. Whence also the error of their initial theoretical premises: the proposition concerning the value of information in itself irrespective of and unconnected with the possibility of its social application and use and the ideas concerning its general accessibility only on the basis of purely technical achievements, irrespective of specific social conditions and political institutions.

Other schools in the bourgeois economist and sociologist environment, on the other hand, accentuate attention on the dangers of the "microelectronic revolution". It is noted, *inter alia*, that the computerization process is being accompanied by a trend toward dehumanization, the increased manipulation of public opinion and control over private life and increased social inequality in the sphere of obtaining and using information.

Under the conditions of capitalist society microelectronics is being used by the ruling class to create new social barriers. The American TIME magazine quotes from the book by sociologist (Ketrin Fishman) "The Computer Establishment": "Even today, when computers are widespread, they remain machines for the few. They are an instrument for helping the rich become richer."²³ Programming tuition is being introduced, as a rule, only in schools where white children are taught and whose parents belong to the "middle class" and higher. Negro youth, among whom unemployment is 50 percent, finds itself faced with a new barrier on the way to a job.

A special OECD report (May 1981) entitled "Vulnerability of the Computerized Society" emphasized that the mass use of microelectronics represents a serious danger at the international relations level also. The dependence of countries importing modern information equipment on the exporting countries is increasing, and the danger of economic and political pressure under the threat of a halt to electronic equipment and software supplies is appearing. The international information system based on electronic data banks becomes vulnerable from a change in the political situation.

At the same time microelectronics is creating the material possibility of the broadest spread of information, the introduction to scientific knowledge and cultural values of broad masses of the world's population and a stimulation of their social activity.

A whole number of conditions, including public ownership of information technology and the working people's democratic control over the entire system of collection, analysis and dissemination of data ensuring free access and the possibility of its use in the interests of the whole of society, is, however, essential for the realization of these objective possibilities. Under the conditions of capitalism, however, the trend toward the monopolization of information science and its use in the selfish interests of the monopolies is manifested increasingly distinctly as the use of data systems based on microelectronics expands.

The mass application of microelectronics at enterprises and in offices has exacerbated the question of administrative control at places of work. The appearance of concealed television cameras and miniature listening and recording devices has put in the hands of the administration a powerful new means of exercising strict control over the personnel.

In addition to special systems the new equipment itself and automated units, including microprocessors, may also be used for such control. Microelectronic transmitters record equipment's work time. Automatic printers, which can at the end of each work day issue data on the number of operations performed, the duration of work time, the number of mistakes made by the operator and so forth, are being employed increasingly extensively in offices. All this makes it possible to strictly regulate the time of work operations, reduce rest pauses to the utmost and increase labor intensiveness. It is a question, as a special supplement devoted to social problems of microelectronics of the French LE MONDE emphasizes, of a revival of Taylorism on a new technical basis.²⁴

The latest information equipment is being employed increasingly extensively in job hiring. Approximately 500,000 persons undergo a lie-detector test annually in the United States when being hired by private firms. Further, the administration of the firms is beginning to make increasingly extensive use of medical data on the state of health of its workers and employees and also of those just starting work. The insurance companies involved in life insurance transactions also make extensive use of medical data. A consortium of insurance companies controls a medical information agency, which has a file on more than 10 million Americans. The information of this agency is supplied regularly to 700 firms.²⁵ Medical ethics and medical secrecy are thus violated.

The practice of the collection and sale of information on deals concluded by credit companies are becoming increasingly widespread. Approximately 25 million reports on them are compiled annually in the United States. Credit companies' data banks store information extending to more than half of the U.S. population. "Confidential" reports including not only the financial position of this person or the other but also his political views and way of life are compiled to the order of insurance companies and firms.

Microelectronic media are being used on an incomparably large scale for the collection of information and control over the individual on the part of the bourgeois state. In the United States the federal authorities have files containing altogether details of 3.5 billion of citizens' private affairs (an average of 15 per American). These include FBI files and IRS and Social Security Administration files. In addition, according to data of Prof D. Linowes, who headed the federal Commission for Safeguarding the Privacy of Private Life, 79 percent of the banks, 47 percent of the insurance companies and 58 percent of other private firms communicate to government establishment more information concerning citizens than provided for by current legislation.

Thus the threat of the monopolization of information equipment, the information itself and its use in the interests of a narrow circle of persons occupying the dominant positions in the economic and political system of modern capitalist society is becoming increasingly distinct.

Progress in the sphere of microelectronics together with the development of laser technology and biotechnology is creating practicable prerequisites for the automation of basic production processes, which is affording an opportunity for an increase tens and hundreds of times over in social labor productivity, a change in the entire structure of material production and the fundamental transformation of the system of obtaining, processing and transmitting data.

However, under capitalist conditions the development of the production forces is coming into increasingly acute contradiction with production relations and is accompanied by considerable social costs. The introduction of labor-saving equipment is causing a reduction in employment and the growth of unemployment even in periods of a production upturn. There is a sharp exacerbation of the competitive struggle on world markets, in the course of which the major TNC, which have monopolized the development and production of the latest equipment, are squeezing out and ruining their competitors, exporting unemployment to the technically less developed countries.

The mass application at enterprises and in offices of microelectronic information equipment is leading to increased administrative control, strict regulation of the labor process and an increase in labor intensiveness, that is, to a revival of Taylorism on a new technical basis.

The dehumanizing impact of the new technology is also being manifested increasingly acutely in social life in connection with the expansion of the technical opportunities for the exercise of all-embracing control over private life, limiting the citizens' rights and freedoms and manipulating public opinion. The danger of the monopolization of information technology and the information and their use in the interests of a narrow circle of persons occupying the dominating positions in the economic and political system of contemporary capitalist society is growing.

FOOTNOTES

1. J. Rada, "The Impact of Microelectronics," Geneva, 1981, p 59.
2. THE OECD OBSERVER, September 1983, p 12.
3. It should be noted that the data on the number of robots available in this country or the other published in the press often do not concur and even differ sharply. This is explained by the fact that the very concept "robot" is sometimes interpreted too broadly and is employed in respect of comparatively simple manipulators intended by design for performing merely one operation, while a robot, as defined by specialists, is a multipurpose automated machine possessing one or several manipulators and capable of performing a whole number of production operations, operating under the control of a minicomputer or microprocessor. This is the criterion used in OECD estimate adduced above.
4. In the estimation of American experts, by 1983 there were over 36,000 robots and manipulators in Japan (TIME, 30 May 1983, p 51).
5. See FORTUNE, 21 February 1983, pp 53-57.
6. See J. Rada, Op. cit., pp 53, 54.
7. See FORTUNE, 16 May 1983, p 152.
8. See TIME, 30 May 1983, p 52.
9. SOCIAL AND LABOR BULLETIN No 4, 1982, p 449.
10. AMERICAN MACHINIST, April 1983, p 116.
11. BUSINESS WEEK, 28 March 1983, pp 50-53.
12. See "Microelectronics, Productivity and Employment," Paris, 1981, p 46.
13. BUSINESS WEEK, 3 August 1981, pp 52-55.
14. See C. Norman, "Microelectronics at Work: Productivity and Jobs in the World Economy," Washington, 1980.
15. See INTERNATIONAL LABOR REVIEW No 6, 1980, pp 705-721.
16. See SOCIAL PROBLEM, vol 25, No 1, October 1977, pp 55-56.
17. See "Technical Change and Employment," London, 1974, p 111.
18. See "Microelectronics, Productivity and Employment," p 162.
19. THE WALL STREET JOURNAL, 22 January 1981.

20. See SOCIAL AND LABOR BULLETIN No 3, 1982, p 306.
21. For more detail on the "information society" concept see MEMO No 4, 1984, pp 106-114.
22. FUTURIST, August 1981, pp 5-13.
23. TIME, 3 January 1983, p 12.
24. See LE MONDE, 20-21 March 1983.
25. U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 12 July 1982, p 35.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850
CSO: 1816/10

IMEMO ROUNDTABLE ON IMPROVING UN PEACEKEEPING ROLE

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6, Jun 84
pp 99-131

[Excerpts] A colloquium was held in the MEMO editorial office on questions of the UN role in the modern world and ways of increasing its effectiveness. Research assistants of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economy and International Relations and other research and practical organizations participated.

The journal's editorial office offers for readers' attention abridged texts of the speeches of the participants in the colloquium.

G. Morozov: The United Nations in International Relations

While compelled in the atmosphere of tempestuous general democratic upsurge at the culminating stage of the war to consent to the founding of a world organization on truly democratic principles, the West's imperialist circles by no means intended abiding seriously by the commitments which they assumed in accordance with the UN Charter. They took the path of systematic violation of this international charter, as far as the outright flouting of its fundamental principles. It may be claimed with every justification that this policy has now reached its apogee.

Flagrantly violating the course of international relations which had normalized in the years of detente and the aims and principles of the United Nations, the United States and its closest NATO allies have initiated an arms race of unprecedented proportions, declared vast regions of the world and the territory of dozens of sovereign states a zone of their imperialist interests and are spurring in the world an atmosphere of hostility and confrontation, which is fraught with the threat of nuclear war.

Such a policy cannot fail to exert a negative influence on the state of affairs in the United Nations, whose platform representatives of the United States and its partners are endeavoring to use as a channel of the aggressive policy, which is hostile to the interests of mankind. The UN General Assembly 38th Session showed this particularly graphically. It demonstrated in full Washington's

attitude toward the United Nations and its obligations as a member of this organization. The Reagan administration aspires, *inter alia*, to cancel the United Nations' useful experience in the sphere of curbing the arms race, paralyze its activity in this sphere altogether and impede the proper functioning of the United Nations in the settlement of international conflicts.

The United States is most actively undermining the foundation of the United Nations' vital activity and its possibilities of positively influencing the state of international relations. In particular, it has made a cynical attempt to impede the General Assembly in the exercise of its functions of an international forum within whose framework bilateral consultations are held. It did not stop short at the unprecedented act of depriving the head of the Soviet delegation, A.A. Gromyko, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR foreign minister, of the opportunity of participating in the General Assembly 38th Session.

It is significant that such actions are being combined with propaganda aimed at discrediting the United Nations. Unwilling to become reconciled to the loss therein of the dominating positions of the cold war times, the United States is attempting to portray it as an "arena of senseless disputes" and a "tyranny of an irresponsible majority".

The USSR's position is fundamentally different. And in the present, extremely complicated atmosphere also the USSR is continuing to defend the principles and letter and spirit of the UN Charter and struggle for its most effective use possible for an improvement in the political climate, sure prevention of a thermonuclear catastrophe, the settlement of international disputes and the preservation and expansion of cooperation.

In recent years alone the USSR has proclaimed from the General Assembly platform such large-scale initiatives as renunciation of first use of nuclear weapons, a draft declaration on the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe, draft treaties on the most urgent questions of curbing the arms race and disarmament and a whole number of other proposals. However, the United States and its NATO allies have greeted these initiatives with unconcealed hostility.

The experience of the United Nations testifies that when its participants act in concert, taking advantage of the opportunities contained in the charter, positive results have been achieved. The United Nations as a forum of international diplomacy is contributing to a considerable extent to the wide-ranging discussion and solution of a number of most important law-making body: acts contributing to the progressive development of international law have been developed in its subdivision or under its aegis. Such documents adopted by the General Assembly as the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Declaration of Principles of International Law Concerning States' Friendly Relations and Cooperation in Accordance With the UN Charter, the Definition of Aggression and the Declaration on Extending and Consolidating the Relaxation of International Tension and also the conventions regulating states' sea and space activity which it has approved may serve as specific examples. The passing of useful resolutions, however, does not in itself signify the practical solution of problems, to which the experience of

the examination within the United Nations of the Near East conflict and many disarmament questions, for example, testifies. Fulfillment of the resolutions corresponding to the aims and principles of the UN Charter is of exceptional importance in this connection.

Soberly evaluating the place which the United Nations occupies in international life, it may be asserted that, despite all the difficulties and obstacles created by the forces of imperialism and reaction, this organization is making a considerable positive contribution to the preservation of peace.

The will and resolve of the international community have repeatedly restrained the aggressive aspirations of American imperialism. The United Nations also plays a certain part in this respect. Tremendous significance is attached to the mass antiwar movement which has unfolded currently in the West European countries and the United States itself and whose participants are inspired by the noble goal of protecting mankind from a thermonuclear catastrophe. And it is profoundly natural that the General Assembly 38th Session adopted a recommendation on the initiative of the socialist and nonaligned countries on the rendering of assistance to the mass antiwar, antimissile movement.

The session's decisions pertaining to the elimination of centers of tension created as a result of the intrigues of imperialist circles and forces following their lead also point toward removal of the threat to peace and the consolidation of international security.

I. Ivanov: Forum of Multilateral Diplomacy

A most characteristic feature of UN activity is undoubtedly the fact that an entirely special form of foreign policy activity, namely, multilateral diplomacy, which currently is supplementing increasingly and in some instances replacing traditional bilateral relations between countries, has taken shape and constituted itself here.

This process is perfectly logical for diplomacy itself must inevitably be modified in the wake of a change in the social relations which it serves. The progressive internationalization of economic and political life, the democratization of international relations, including the appearance in the world arena of more than 100 emergent states, the increase in the number of interstate problems simply not susceptible to bilateral solutions and the substantial increase in the number of international organizations form the objective basis of this process. As a result multilateral diplomacy is increasingly becoming a special kind of political art, and the number of specialists involved in it is growing in the personnel of all countries' foreign policy departments.*

* Some 64 percent of U.S. State Department officers and 88 percent of the employees of the Norwegian Foreign Ministry have engaged in multilateral diplomacy--if only for some time--in the course of their careers. This work was the main work for 15 percent of the American and 40 percent of the Norwegian diplomats here. Roughly the same data are produced by polls conducted in other Western countries, with, as a rule, an increase in this proportion in inverse proportion to the size of the country.

Multilateral diplomacy has now acquired legitimacy not only in the United Nations but also beyond--in international organizations and regional groupings, in the course of trade negotiations and so forth. However, the activity of the United Nations and its bodies characterizes its particular features most fully and comprehensively. These specific features consist primarily of its far greater complication, but greater opportunities compared with bilateral diplomacy, with the introduction thereto of many elements of parliamentarianism. Different dimensions are also assumed by the process of negotiations itself, where there is usually a clash of the collective positions of groups of countries, and it itself becomes a multilevel process incorporating the prenegotiation concordance of group positions. Finally, the very performance by diplomatic workers of their official functions also proceeds under different conditions.

Recently the UN Secretariat itself, which formally has to provide for negotiations only in the technical respect, has also in fact frequently performed the role of participant in negotiations. The Secretariat usually has at its disposal a number of skilled personnel only rarely at the disposal of a delegation, and for this reason its opinion at the negotiations is authoritative. It prepares the working papers, which, of course, influence the course of the debate. Frequently it also performs operational work for elective conference officials, again influencing their opinion. Whence the struggle for the most influential positions in the Secretariat is understandable. For example, even the archconservative American Heritage Foundation research group, which frequently makes demagogic appeals for the removal of the United Nations from the United States, sounds the alarm in its more serious works in connection with the reduction in the number of U.S. citizens in the positions of international officials in the United Nations.

Finally, there are also particular features in the United Nations' day-to-day diplomatic life. As distinct from the work of an embassy in some country or other, the diplomat in the United Nations, which gathers under one roof the representatives of all countries of the world, had immeasurably greater opportunities for contacts, collecting information and meetings with people of different levels since the level of representation in individual delegations is usually dissimilar. Practice shows that "multilateral" communication imparts to diplomacy such new qualities as greater frankness, a chance to check and recheck information and a multiplicity of channels of obtaining it. At least 83 percent of the diplomats polled believes that in the United Nations there are more opportunities for contacts without ceremony, while 68 percent believes that conversations are more candid here. More than 90 percent of those polled noted particularly the accessibility of informal contacts with colleagues from nonfriendly countries, which are hardly possible at an official bilateral level.

It is significant that the possibilities of the United Nations are valued particularly by the diplomats of small countries. The work here enables them to establish contacts with all interested states without necessarily maintaining a special diplomatic apparatus in them. They believe that the difficulty of contacts with countries which are superior to them in terms of their political weight or potential, which is perceived particularly keenly in the event of bilateral negotiations, is largely removed here (so 72 percent of

the diplomats polled believes). Small countries in the United Nations can use the world press and nongovernment organizations and, finally, operate as a group, multiplying their political weight. The "one country--one vote" principle which has been adopted in the United Nations contributes to this. For this reason 68 percent of diplomats polled believed that multilateral diplomacy in the United Nations additionally strengthens the positions of the small, including emergent, countries in the modern world.

A. Kalyadin: Prevention of Nuclear War in the Activity of the World Community

According to the charter, the United Nations is the center which is called on to coordinate states' actions aimed at preventing wars and conflicts. The rules and provisions contained in the UN Charter are of fundamental significance for the organization's fulfillment of its main function. It has to be acknowledged that the United Nations' responsibility to the peoples in tackling the fundamental task of the present day is being recognized increasingly broadly by the community of states cooperating fruitfully within the UN framework. The UN General Assembly First Special Disarmament Session (1978) recognized in the Final Document, which was adopted by general consent, that "the removal of threat of world war... is the most acute and urgent present-day task." And in subsequent years the organization has undertaken large-scale moral-political actions to frustrate the plans of the bellicose adventurists pushing the world in the abyss of nuclear catastrophe.

I would like to dwell on the set of most important Soviet initiatives in this sphere. In the 1980's the Soviet Union submitted for UN examination proposals of exceptional significance aimed at preventing and removing the threat of nuclear war and strengthening the political, legal and material guarantees of the security of all states. Together with measures aimed at halting and turning back the race in nuclear arms (freezing, reducing and liquidating them) the USSR put forward a draft universal treaty banning the use of force in international relations.

It was again emphasized at the CPSU Central Committee February (1984) Plenum that the Soviet Union is doing everything in the name of delivering mankind from the threat of world nuclear war. The USSR is pursuing in the United Nations a policy of active cooperation with other states which are prepared to lead matters in the direction of a strengthening of the foundations of peace and an increase in the role, full use of the possibilities and realization of the decisions of the United Nations.

It has to be observed that the United Nations has already adopted a number of important, far-reaching documents aimed at lessening the nuclear threat. A tremendous positive role would be performed by all countries' implementation of the recommendations contained in UN General Assembly declarations--on preventing nuclear catastrophe (1981) and on condemning nuclear war (1983).

In the declaration "Condemnation of Nuclear War" the General Assembly Emphatically, unreservedly and for all time condemned nuclear war as contrary to human conscience and reason, as a most heinous crime against the peoples and as the flouting of man's primary right--the right to life (clause 1).

The declaration simultaneously condemns the development, promotion, dissemination and propaganda of political and military doctrines and ideas proving the "legitimacy" of the first use of nuclear weapons, as also the "permissibility" of the unleashing of nuclear war in general (clause 2). The General Assembly called for a unification and multiplication of efforts for the sake of removing the threat of nuclear war, halting the race in nuclear arms and reducing them to the point of complete liquidation (clause 3).

Thus, for example, the General Assembly recommended that the Disarmament Committee include on the agenda the question of measures to prevent nuclear war and set up a working group to conduct the corresponding negotiations. This question is now on the agenda of the Disarmament Conference. However, its constructive examination is being blocked by certain NATO countries, which are opposed to the setting up of a working group for conducting negotiations on measures of preventing nuclear war. The Soviet Union, the other socialist states and nonaligned and neutral countries are seeking the speediest start on such negotiations in accordance with the recommendations of the General Assembly, of its 38th Session included.

Exceptional significance is now attached to the documents adopted by the General Assembly determining the optimum paths of solution of the most acute problems in the prevention of nuclear war. These are resolutions on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, the banning of tests thereof, a nuclear arms freeze, no first use of nuclear weapons, the strengthening of the security guarantees of nonnuclear states, the creation of nuclear-free zones in different parts of the world, the banning of neutron weapons and a number of others.

Under the conditions of the increase in tension in the world and the intensification of the arms race the United Nations is called on to give the highest priority to the organization of states' cooperation in the business of disarmament. Of course, determining significance is attached to the internal processes in the UN member-states, which condition the existence, lack or absence of the political will to achieve international accords on the corresponding problems. Large-scale political decisions at state level are what are needed primarily. At the same time, as experience shows, the United Nations is capable to a certain extent of influencing the molding of public opinion in this country or the other, for example, in support of measures in the disarmament sphere, and contributing to the rapprochement of different states' positions and the surmounting of the resistance of the forces which are not interested in a relaxation of tension and disarmament.

A particular role would be performed by the adoption of the standards of relations between the nuclear powers proposed by the USSR, which pursue the aims of consolidating peace and nuclear disarmament. In particular, all states could adopt legislative enactments condemning nuclear war and propaganda thereof in any form. All nuclear states which have yet to do this should undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

It is essential to encourage the active use of all existing channels for practical negotiations on question of disarmament, detente and the prevention of nuclear war and the opening of essential new forums for negotiations in this sphere.

A UN General Assembly appeal to all states possessing nuclear weapons which have yet to do this that they conclude with the other states which possess such weapons agreements concerning measures to prevent the accidental or unsanctioned use of nuclear weapons and to nuclear states between which such agreements exist that they perfect and develop these measures would be of considerable benefit.

It is also necessary to step up the activity of the corresponding services of the UN Secretariat for the spread of information concerning the disastrous consequences of nuclear war and the arms race.

The United Nations is also called on to contribute to the mobilization of public opinion in favor of disarmament, particularly within the framework of the world disarmament campaign.

The activity of the United Nations and its specialized institution--UNESCO--in the sphere of education in a spirit of peace and in support of disarmament could be used even more purposefully in the interests of a halt to the arms race and disarmament.

The situation in the world insistently demands unification of the efforts of all peoples and states, under the aegis of the United Nations included, in order to save mankind and civilization on Earth from the increased threat of nuclear extermination, halt the insane arms buildup and ensure man's right to life. Political will, recognition by statesmen and public figures of their profound responsibility for the fate of mankind and an ability to rise above narrow, egotistical interests of the moment and subordinate them to human values and welfare are essential for this. To prevent nuclear war--such is the slogan of the day. The United Nations is called on to broaden its contribution to this most important human concern. The prospects of a growth in the United Nations' positive influence on world politics and its future are also connected with this aspect of its activity to a considerable extent.

Yu. Tomilin: Specific Nuclear Disarmament Measures

Certain NATO countries are publicizing the "deterrence" and "balance of fear" doctrines, which are allegedly capable of saving the world from war. The flaw in these concepts is that they do not remove but, on the contrary, increase the danger of the outbreak of wars and justify a buildup of arsenals of weapons, of the most lethal kind, furthermore, intended for mass extermination of everything living on Earth.

The socialist community countries have a fundamentally different approach to the removal of the threat of nuclear war--not a "balance of fear" and not an escalation of "deterrence" but the prevention of war, a curbing of the arms race and a transition to disarmament, nuclear particularly. Not "deterrence" but the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, the strengthening of trust between them and unwavering observance of the principle of equality and equal security. At the same time the socialist countries have declared repeatedly that under no circumstances will they permit military superiority over them. A cardinally important direction of the multilateral

efforts to prevent nuclear war is the adoption of specific measures designed to prevent the doctrines and ideas substantiating the expediency of the unleashing of nuclear war being underpinned by a base in the form of new arms systems.

A most effective and comparatively easily implemented measure in this field could be a freeze, given the appropriate supervision, of nuclear arms quantitatively and qualitatively. Back in the summer of 1983 the Soviet Union addressed such a proposal to the United States and Britain, France and China, which, unfortunately, turned it down.

In the fall of the same year the UN General Assembly 38th Session emphatically advocated at the Soviet Union's initiative a nuclear arms freeze, calling on all nuclear states to consent to such a step, given appropriate supervision, and, furthermore, it was implied that the USSR and the United States, which have the biggest nuclear arsenals, would primarily and simultaneously freeze their nuclear arms on a bilateral basis by way of example to the other nuclear states. Following them, the latter also were to freeze their nuclear arms as quickly as possible. The achievement of such an arrangement would not require complex and prolonged negotiations.

At the same time, however, a nuclear freeze would contribute to the consolidation of strategic stability, which is being undermined by the deployment of new nuclear weapons systems. As a result there would be a change in the direction of an improvement in the general atmosphere in the world.

Besides the Soviet Union, the idea of a freeze was put forward in the United Nations by certain other countries also. India, for example, proposed that a freeze be implemented by all five nuclear states. Mexico and Sweden were responsible for a draft resolution on a bilateral freeze--for the USSR and the United States. The Soviet Union's approach, on the other hand, as shown above, combined both ideas.

The mere fact of a whole number of states' advocacy of a freeze testifies to the urgent, pressing nature of this measure. Its realization is being blocked, however, by the United States and other Western states. Their representatives demagogically declare that a freeze would consolidate the present "imbalance" in the nuclear arms sphere in favor of the Soviet Union and that it is necessary not to freeze nuclear arms but to reduce them. A now traditional method of Western diplomacy was also used: attempts were made to drown the idea in difficulties of supervision. Such "reasoning" merely betrays the U.S. Administration's aspiration to prevent the creation of obstacles to the unchecked buildup of its nuclear arsenals.

Many countries are criticizing the assertions concerning the existence of a "nuclear imbalance" in favor of the Soviet Union. Resolutions passed on the initiative of Mexico and Sweden at the General Assembly 37th and 38th sessions specially emphasize that "the existing conditions are the most favorable for such a freeze inasmuch as the USSR and the United States currently have equal nuclear military power and, as would seem obvious, overall approximate parity exists between them."

Neither the Soviet Union nor other initiators of freeze proposals have claimed that a freeze is an end in itself inasmuch as the threat of nuclear war exists at the present level of military confrontation also. We regard a nuclear freeze as an important step along the path of a halt to the race in nuclear arms and their appreciable limitation and radical reduction and, ultimately, complete liquidation. This was said with exhaustive clarity in the very text of the Soviet proposal. The hypocrisy of the Western representatives becomes particularly apparent if it is considered that Soviet initiatives pertaining to a nuclear disarmament program have been on the negotiating table in the Disarmament Committee for a whole number of years now and that it is only owing to the negative position of the United States and its allies that the measures to reduce nuclear arms envisaged by these proposals have not become the subject of agreements.

It is frequently heard that a nuclear arms freeze is not susceptible to supervision and is therefore unacceptable. Such assertions do not withstand criticism. The Soviet Union believes that a freeze could be monitored with the aid of national technical facilities. A similar opinion has been expressed repeatedly by a number of ranking American politicians and qualified specialists. Among those sharing such a conclusion are former Defense Secretary C. Clifford, former CIA Director W. Colby, P. Warnke, former director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, A. Harriman and many others. Nor is it inappropriate to recall that the Soviet Union has expressed readiness, if necessary, to develop certain additional control measures in this sphere with regard for the results of arms limitation negotiations conducted previously.

The announcement by all states which possess nuclear weapons of a moratorium on all nuclear explosions as far as the conclusion of a treaty on the complete and general banning of nuclear weapon tests would contribute to a halt to the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and the creation of models and types thereof. A proposal on this score has already been put forward by the Soviet Union. A moratorium would be an effective barrier in the way of a qualitative nuclear arms race and, in particular, of the appearance of the most destabilizing types of such weapons intended to inflict a first strike. As is known, the USSR also responded positively to the General Assembly appeal that the United States, Great Britain and the USSR immediately cease, as an interim measure, all test nuclear explosions. Undoubtedly, the effect of such a moratorium should be limited to a certain specified time with the possibility of its extension depending on the conduct of the other nuclear powers. Of course, banning tests of such nuclear weapons could be a dependable barrier in the way of the growth of the danger of war as a result of the qualitative improvement in such weapons. This question has been examined by the UN General Assembly and the Disarmament Committee as a priority issue for a whole number of years now. The "Basic Provisions of a Treaty on the Complete and General Banning of Nuclear Weapons Tests," which was submitted by the Soviet Union to the General Assembly 37th Session, represent a sound basis for the achievement of agreement. The said document reflects the degree of accord achieved in the course of foregoing discussion of the problem.

Progress here also, however, is being blocked by the United States. It has suspended the trilateral (USSR--United States--Britain) negotiations, declined to ratify the treaties of 1974 (on limiting nuclear weapons tests) and 1976 (on peaceful nuclear explosions) and is not consenting to the announcement of a moratorium. Finally, it is sabotaging in every possible way the start of multilateral negotiations in the Disarmament Committee for the purpose of the elaboration of a treaty on the complete and general banning of nuclear weapons tests. The recent response of the American Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to a congressional committee inquiry leaves no doubts as to the reasons for such a position. Nuclear tests, the response says, "are necessary for the development and modernization of warheads, maintaining the reliability of stockpiles and evaluating the effect of the use of nuclear arms."

The General Assembly 38th Session confirmed that the question of banning nuclear weapons tests remains a paramount issue. Not only all the socialist and nonaligned states but also a considerable number of Western states--Australia, Denmark, Canada, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway and Japan--supported the start of negotiations on this question.

In the atmosphere of the growing nuclear threat particular urgency is attached to the task of strengthening the practice of the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, primarily in connection with the possibility of the appearance of such weapons in Israel and South Africa. Intensive work on the creation of such is under way in Pakistan. The spread of nuclear weapons, particularly in areas of higher-than-usual military danger, would undoubtedly do great damage not only to regional but also international security. This is why the question of the creation in various parts of the world of zones free of nuclear weapons is a very acute issue in the United Nations.

Together with measures directly concerning nuclear weapons a halt to and the prevention of the arms race in other most destabilizing areas also would contribute to the consolidation of international security to a large extent. The prevention of an arms race in space, which is fraught with a manifold increase in the risk of nuclear war, would be of particular significance in this direction. The programs of the creation of a broad-scale ABM system currently being developed in the United States cannot remove the threat of the thermonuclear arsenals hanging over the world but merely make their use more likely. For this reason the socialist countries insistently propose the announcement of a moratorium on any types of antisatellite weapon being put into space. Of course, the prevention of an arms race in space altogether would be an even broader and more far-reaching measure.

G. Stashevskiy: The Struggle for the Banning and Liquidation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and a Reduction in Conventional Arms

From the very start of its activity the United Nations has played an important part in the struggle to remove such lethal types of weapons of mass destruction as chemical, bacteriological and radiological weapons and to prevent the creation of new weapons of mass destruction.

At the UN General Assembly 24th Session (1969) the socialist countries proposed a radical and simultaneous solution of the problem of chemical and

bacteriological weapons by way of their complete liquidation and a halt to their production. However, the United States and certain of its NATO allies proposed agreement at first merely on bacteriological weapons. Taking this into consideration and also wishing to accelerate the solution of the problem, the USSR and other socialist countries submitted to the Disarmament Committee in 1971 a draft convention on banning the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxic weapons and on their destruction. This document became the basis for negotiations, as a result of which a draft convention which the General Assembly recommended that all states sign was prepared. Taking effect in 1975, the convention was the first such measure of actual disarmament in postwar history and it afforded an opportunity for the removal from states' arsenals and the destruction of an entire type of dangerous weapon of mass destruction, thereby removing the possibility of a war being unleashed involving use thereof. Following ratification of the convention, the governments of the USSR, the United States and Britain issued declarations that they would not possess stockpiles of bacteriological (biological) weapons and toxins and equipment and delivery systems therefor.

Since 1972 the Disarmament Committee has had for examination a draft convention submitted by the socialist countries providing for a complete ban on all combat chemical agents. At the UN General Assembly Second Special Disarmament Session (1982) the USSR submitted a comprehensive document--"Basic Provisions of a Convention on Banning the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction"--which is being discussed by the Disarmament Committee. The Soviet document, together with the supplementary supervision proposals submitted in 1984, opens the way for the speedy achievement of an accord on all aspects of the problem, including supervision, which the United States and certain Western countries are attempting to use to justify their negative position. It is not, of course, only a question of supervision. As K.U. Chernenko observed in his replies to questions put by PRAVDA published on 9 April, "with regard for the policy and, indeed, the practice of the United States we are not less and, perhaps, more interested than it in reliable supervision adequate to specific arms limitation and disarmament measures." The Soviet draft provides for a dependable verification mechanism based on a combination of national control facilities and international procedures, including regular on-site inspection. In recent years the General Assembly has repeatedly recommended that the Disarmament Committee speed up the development of a draft convention banning chemical weapons. It has appealed to the USSR and the United States for a resumption of bilateral negotiations on this question. As far as the socialist countries are concerned, they have supported in the United Nations the adoption of a number of important measures whose realization could create a favorable atmosphere for progress toward the complete banning and destruction of chemical weapons. A resolution approved by the General Assembly 38th Session on the draft of a number of socialist and nonaligned states, in spite of the opposition of the United States and certain other NATO countries, proposes that the Disarmament Committee stimulate negotiations for the development of a convention on the banning and liquidation of chemical weapons. Together with this the Assembly called on all states to refrain from the production and deployment of binary and other new types of chemical weapons and also from the

deployment of such weapons on the territory of other states. The Assembly evinced a positive attitude toward proposals for the creation of zones free of chemical weapons.

As the work of the Disarmament Committee's spring session showed, the United States is unwilling to consent to the banning of chemical weapons. The extensively publicized "new proposals" pertaining to the banning of chemical weapons submitted by U.S. Vice President G. Bush at the conference in April are convincing testimony to this. Control provisions knowingly unacceptable to the USSR and many other states are an inalienable part of them.

A prominent place in the struggle which has unfolded in the United Nations with respect to disarmament issues is occupied by the problem of preventing the possibility of the appearance in states' arsenals of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction which, many specialists believe, could be far superior to those which exist at present in terms of their casualty-producing effect. All this makes urgently necessary the adoption of international measures capable of preventing the switch of the arms race to a qualitatively new phase. Guided by these considerations, back in 1975 the USSR proposed the conclusion of a treaty banning the development and production of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. A draft treaty was submitted to the Assembly which was subsequently passed on to the Disarmament Committee. At subsequent sessions the General Assembly repeatedly expressed support for the radical solution of the problem championed by the Soviet Union--the elaboration of an all-embracing agreement--and appealed to the Disarmament Committee for negotiations on this problem with the participation of qualified experts. However, the United States and other NATO powers are evading the elaboration of an agreement, which could prevent the use of the latest scientific achievements to the detriment of mankind. Evidently, ruling circles in the United States still cannot part with the illusory dreams of bursting ahead in the "technology race" and creating new "superweapons" for the sake of achieving military superiority over the USSR.

In 1977 the USSR supplemented its draft with provisions which provided for the possibility together with the general banning of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction of the conclusion of individual agreements banning specific types of such weapons as they appear. In addition, the Soviet Union proposed that the permanent members of the Security Council and also other militarily significant states make most urgently, as a first step toward the signing of an all-embracing agreement, statements of similar content on a renunciation of the creation of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction. Although the UN General Assembly supported this Soviet initiative also, the NATO countries remained deaf to its appeal.

The question of the banning of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons has acquired great urgency in recent years. The point being that large stocks of fissionable material suitable for the manufacture of combat radiological weapons are being accumulated with the development of nuclear power. The danger of the use of such weapons is increasing in connection with the appearance of more sophisticated delivery systems therefor. The draft of the basic provisions of a treaty banning radiological weapons,

which was passed on to the Disarmament Committee, was prepared at the 1977-1979 Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva. However, final concordance has been impeded in connection with the unconstructive position of certain states.

The USSR has presented specific proposals in the United Nations aimed at closing off, before it is too late, a new channel of the arms race--preventing its spread to space. This danger is increasing in connection with Washington's implementation of a wide-ranging program of the creation of the latest space arms systems designed to strike targets in space and on Earth. The United States is obviously hoping with the aid of some "absolute weapon" to achieve military superiority. Guided-energy weapons (laser, booster and beam) for the destruction of space, air, ground and sea targets are being developed at a stepped-up pace. The R. Reagan administration has proclaimed a program of the creation of a wide-ranging space ABM system, whose creation (in violation of the 1972 ABM Treaty between the USSR and the United States and the 1974 Protocol thereto) would open the floodgates for the accelerated development of all types of strategic arms--defensive and offensive.

Considering the situation that had been created, the USSR put forward in 1981 the idea of the conclusion of a treaty banning the deployment in space of weapons of any kind. Inasmuch as the development of a treaty in the Disarmament Committee was blocked by the United States and its closest allies, the USSR proposed solving the problem of preventing the militarization of space radically, on an all-embracing basis. It put forward for examination by the General Assembly 38th Session an initiative on the banning of the use of force in space and from space in respect of the Earth and submitted the draft of a corresponding treaty providing for the renunciation of tests of all antisatellite systems, the banning of the creation of new and the liquidation of the sides' existing such systems and also the banning of tests and the use for military, including antisatellite, purposes of manned spaceships. Simultaneously--to facilitate agreement--the USSR imposed a unilateral moratorium on launches into space of all types of antisatellite weapons for the entire time that other states, including the United States, refrain from such launches.

The Soviet initiative formed the basis of the adoption by overwhelming majority at the session of a resolution (opposed only by the United States) which contains an appeal to all states, primarily those with big potential in the space sphere, for the adoption of immediate measures to prevent an arms race in space.

Arms which it is customary to call "conventional" are a serious danger to mankind. They are often close to tactical nuclear weapons in their power of destruction. For this reason the USSR considers the use of all opportunities, including the authority of the United Nations, to prevent a new twist of the spiral of the race not only in nuclear arms but also in all other areas an urgent task. The 26th CPSU Congress again emphasized the importance of efforts aimed at curbing the growth of conventional arms and the army, navy and air force. In accordance with the proposal of a number of socialist countries, the General Assembly 38th Session passed a resolution which recognizes the urgent need for a start on negotiations with the participation of big naval powers on limiting naval activity, limiting and reducing naval arms and the extension of confidence-building measures to the seas and oceans.

V. Fedorov: The Peaceful Settlement of Conflicts

Analyzing UN activity in the sphere of the prevention of conflicts and the peaceful settlement of international disputes, bourgeois experts and politicians usually cite its "ineffectiveness" and pay particular attention to the elaboration of a variety of far-fetched plans and outlines for preventing conflicts and for "control" of them and for creating "mechanisms" contrary to the UN Charter. They frequently absolutize procedural points. Noting that at present there is no "dependable multilateral method of the control of international conflicts," they claim that a strong universal system of collective security, as envisaged by the UN Charter, has proven "utopian and unattainable" and has been "replaced" by peacekeeping operations. However, the problem of preventing conflicts and the peaceful settlement of disputes cannot be reduced to institutional and procedural aspects, although, undoubtedly, they cannot be disregarded. And it is absolutely impermissible to attempt to find a solution thereof on the paths of a revision of the UN Charter. This problem can be settled not in isolation but in the broad context of states' collective efforts based on the principles of peaceful coexistence. And states' concerted measures within the UN framework are of importance here.

The UN Charter contains the special Chapter VI, which is devoted to the methods and means of the peaceful settlement of international disputes. UN members have the obligation primarily to try to settle their disputes by way of negotiation, investigation, mediation, reconciliation, arbitration, trial and appeal to regional bodies or agreements or by other peaceful means according to their choice. When it deems it necessary, the Security Council demands of the parties that they settle their disputes with the help of such means.

Besides the traditional methods enumerated in article 33, the charter points to specific methods of settling disputes by the Security Council, emphasizing the definite role of the latter in this process.

A specific feature of the peaceful settlement system is strict delineation of the powers of the Security Council and the General Assembly. Although any dispute or situation may be brought to the attention of the latter, it settles such matters with regard for the fact that it passes on to the Security Council before or after discussion each question on which action must be taken. The General Assembly cannot make any recommendations concerning a given dispute or situation when the Security Council is performing the functions entrusted to it by the charter, if it itself has not requested this. With observance of the same conditions the General Assembly may recommend measures for the peaceful settlement of any situation, irrespective of its origin. As the more than 38-year practice of the United Nations shows, over 70 percent of all the disputes it has examined have been the subject of discussion and decision on questions connected with maintaining international peace and security have, as a rule, been submitted for its examination.

At the same time, however, the UN Charter does not prevent the peaceful settlement of local disputes, given the assistance of regional agreements or regional bodies, prior to their being passed on to the Security Council and even encourages this practice.

The USSR resolutely supports all contentious issues between states being settled peacefully, without blackmail and threats. According to its firm belief, given good will and a prudent approach, with regard for objective conditions, any global or regional problem can be settled.

The role and responsibility of the United Nations and its Security Council in the peaceful settlement of disputes and conflicts between states, the preservation of universal peace and the prevention of nuclear war are growing particularly under the conditions of the sharply exacerbated international situation. Pursuing a policy of discrediting the United Nations and flagrantly violating the basic principles of its charter, the United States aspires to belittle this world forum's contribution to the settlement of the disputes submitted for its examination. In addition, some American international affairs experts go as far as to claim that the United Nations has itself "become a principal cause of global disagreements."

However, the facts show how substantial are the assets of the United Nations. Thus, as acknowledged by Western experts themselves, of the more than 150 disputes and conflict situations submitted since the war for examination by UN bodies, less than a dozen have remained unsettled. The Soviet Union invariably supports the efforts made by the organization in this sphere. "We," K.U. Chernenko emphasized, "are open to peaceful mutually profitable cooperation with the states of all continents. We support the settlement of all contentious international problems by way of serious, equal, constructive negotiations."

V. Login: Security Council Actions To Maintain Peace

Upon the founding of the United Nations, the Security Council, as the body entrusted with the main responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, was endowed with very broad powers for taking swift and effective action for this purpose. If the continuation of some dispute or other between states could threaten the preservation of peace, the Security Council has the right to recommend to the parties to the dispute terms for its solution which it finds suitable. In instances where a threat to peace or a breach of peace already exists, the Security Council, in accordance with article 41 of the UN Charter, is empowered to demand of UN members the application of such measures of influence as a suspension of economic or other relations and also a severance of diplomatic relations. If, however, such measures prove insufficient, the Security Council may in accordance with article 42 take the necessary action with the use of armed forces of the UN members, including demonstrations, blockade and other operations. The set of means is very impressive. If the UN members, primarily all the permanent members of the Security Council, aspired to use them as prescribed by the charter, the United Nations would certainly justify the hopes placed in it by the peoples which bore the heavy burden of the struggle against fascism and throughout the past four decades the world would not have known not only big but also "small" wars. At the same time the Soviet Union deems expedient the enlistment of a broad circle of states in participation in the Security Council's work on the preparation and implementation of the corresponding UN operations, including the work of the Security Council Military Staff Committee and participation in overall strategic leadership of the UN forces and also in the operational command of these forces.

However, the policy of the United States and its closest allies, which shortly after the end of the war refused to cooperate with the USSR and which took the path of unconcealed hostility and military preparations against the Soviet Union, led to the mechanism for maintaining international peace and security envisaged by the UN Charter not being activated in practice. Upon the examination of questions concerning the procedure of the Security Council's use of armed forces, from the very outset the Western powers opposed the Soviet Union's just demand for equal participation in the formation of such armed forces of all of the Council's permanent members. Some Western states attempted to create under the auspices of the UN secretary general sometimes some "protection detachment," sometimes a "field service". Having failed here also, the Western powers embarked on the path of creating "UN armed forces" based on General Assembly decisions. This is contrary to the UN Charter, which clearly stipulates that only the Security Council has the right to take action of a preventive or compulsory nature, and, consequently, all decisions connected with the creation and functioning of UN forces may be made only by the Council with the consent of all its permanent members. This statutory provision is intended to serve as a guarantee that the mechanism for maintaining international peace and security not end up in the hands of any state or group of states and not be used in narrow one-sided interests counter to the aims and principles of the UN Charter.

Unfortunately, it was precisely this that occurred when as a result of the efforts of Washington and its NATO partners the leadership of the so-called "UN operations in the Congo" was taken from under the jurisdiction of the Security Council and farmed out to officials of the UN Secretariat from the ranks of citizens of Western states. The tragic experience of the "UN Congo operation" served as a stern warning to those who harbored illusions concerning the possibility of finding protection against an aggressor in circumvention of the UN Charter.

Ideas concerning the limitation or abolition even of the principle of the unanimity of the Security Council permanent members have been put forward recently in connection with the manifold instances of the United States' abuse of the power of veto. The supporters of this approach claim that this would enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations. Should an approach be categorized as illusory and even dangerous, and furthermore, both for the emergent countries themselves and for the United Nations as a whole. The experience accumulated within the organization's framework shows graphically that the principle of the unanimity of the Security Council permanent members is an essential guarantee against possible abuse of the Council's wide-ranging powers on the part of the Western powers in the use of armed force, economic sanctions and other effective measures contrary to the aims and principles of the Charter. The Soviet Union has repeatedly taken advantage of the principle of unanimity for the purpose of protecting the interests of the peoples' national liberation struggle.

It is also necessary to heed the fact that the said principle, at the time the United Nations was set up, essentially enshrined the equality of states with different socioeconomic systems and at the current historical stage reflects the military-strategic equilibrium between them. If the Security Council

lacked the rule of unanimity of its permanent members and decisions on peacekeeping measures were made by majority vote, the attempt of some of the Council's permanent members to employ armed force contrary to the position and interests of the other permanent members of the Council could in practice lead to war with all the ensuing consequences.

This is why an increase in the effectiveness of the United Nations as an instrument for maintaining international peace and security may be achieved only on the paths of unswerving fulfillment of the provisions of the UN Charter and not by means of a break with its fundamental principles. The growth of the assertiveness of all peace-loving states and the international community in exerting a due influence on those who violate the Charter's principles--such is the most effective method of strengthening the UN's role in ensuring peace in the world.

Yu. Yukhananov: Certain Procedural Questions of a Study of UN Activity

It has evolved historically such that the political "component" of the United Nations has been the subject of analysis primarily of the science of international law. This is natural for the reason that the latter made an outstanding contribution to the process of the formulation of the organization's charter and the formulation of the system of its statutory principles and provisions. It is also natural because any decision which is or has been adopted within the UN framework needs expert legal testimony and a political-legal evaluation.

However, the further we move away from the creation and the start of the functioning of the United Nations and the more empirical material is accumulated reflecting the practice of this international organization, which is universal in membership composition and competence, the less adequate merely the political-legal approach to a study of its activity is. A corresponding special study procedure is needed for the scientific assimilation of the huge volume of information accumulated in the process of the almost 40-year functioning of the United Nations. The point being that the expanse of information concerning this sphere of the UN's activity--as, most likely, of any other--contains two inseparable and at the same time different sum totals of facts. One of them is information reflecting the functioning of the General Assembly and the Security Council, that is, the facts reflected in UN documents conditioned by the statutory competence and procedural rules of the said UN bodies. The other is information concerning the phenomena which occur outside of the organization and independently of it in the system of international relations and which serve as the primary material constantly "feeding" the functioning of the organization.

This two-in-one nature of the information pertaining to UN activity in maintaining international peace and security points to the need for a systemic approach to a study of this area of the organization's activity. It is a question of presenting the entire accumulated information concerning UN activity in this sphere for analytical purposes as a certain informational-statistical system, an analysis of which would ensure the accomplishment of the task of "measuring" and objectively evaluating the results of the many years' practice of the United Nations in peacekeeping.

The proposed procedure provides for a quest for information reflecting in primary form data concerning international-political conflicts: the direct parties to the conflict; the type of conflict, determined depending on the international-political characterization of its participants; the date of the emergence of the conflict process; the start of the armed phase; culmination of the entire process. The information thus obtained, reflecting the specific manifestations of the global international-political state of conflict in a corresponding historical period, is the first information block of, in Lenin's words, the essential "foundation of facts".

It is primarily necessary to combine the information "blocks," which reflect, but variously, the same component of the sphere of UN political activity in question. We would observe that this combination is a far from mechanical operation. Although both the said information blocks reflect the same process of the manifestation of the state of international-political conflict, they do not coincide in terms of form. In the first this process is reflected as information concerning the actual conflicts themselves, in the second as information on the corresponding questions of the General Assembly and (or) Security Council agenda. This noncoincidence is not only of a formal nature. The point being that not all conflicts arising in the practice of international-political relations are reflected in question of the agenda of the said bodies of the United Nations for not all of them are an object of its knowledge. Furthermore, the noncoincidence is conditioned by the distinction between the logic categories with the aid of which the sources of the facts are investigated and the corresponding information blocks--"international-political conflict" and "question pertaining to the preservation of international peace and security"--are built.

Both information blocks contain a common element--data on the parties in direct confrontation in the conflict. This makes it possible to combine the said blocks. We would observe that an analysis of each of them separately is also of a certain interest. For example, according to our calculations, in 89 questions (approximately 75 percent of their total) about which the United Nations was informed in the period 1946-1978 eleven capitalist states were a direct confrontational party (individually or jointly); three of them here (the United States, Great Britain and France) were a party in 60 questions, including the United States in 31. If, however, we analyze the first information block, which contains direct information on the conflicts, the "contribution" of the said states to the spurring of the international-political state of conflict becomes even more graphic.

Correlation of the data on conflicts which have been a subject of the functioning of the United Nations, that is, of its knowledge, discussion therein and its "active response," with the aggregate data on all conflicts--both those which have been and which have not been material of its functioning--makes it possible to evaluate more fully the effectiveness of the organization's peacekeeping activity.

It is essential to emphasize with all certainty that the proposed procedure pursues the goal of facilitating a qualitative, content Marxist-Leninist analysis of UN activity in the sphere in question, but in no way substitutes for it.

R. Novikov: Global Problems of the Present Day

The global problems category includes ecological, energy, raw material and food problems and also the task of eliminating the most dangerous diseases. They are a reflection of the relatively acute contradictions in the relations between society and nature which have arisen in the final third of our century.

Several new institutions were added throughout the last decade to those UN institutions which had existed earlier which were responsible for cooperation on global problems, particularly the WHO, the Committee for the Use of Space for Peaceful Purposes, the FAO and the UN Committee for Natural Resources. The former include the World Food Council and the UN Environment Program, Senior Government Advisers of the European Economic Commission for Environmental Problems and a number of others. A preparatory committee to create an international seabed authority is currently at work which is to be the main center of coordination of the use of ocean resources beyond the continental shelf by all states concerned.

Certain successes have been scored in strengthening international cooperation in the use of space. Satellite equipment has been used for many years within the framework of the World Weather Service, which operates on the basis of the World Meteorological Organization. Great practical significance is attached to the UN program for assisting the developing countries in the training of specialists in the sphere of the use of space equipment for tackling this economic task or the other. The question of the creation of a global artificial satellite system for the remote probing of the Earth in the interests of the fuller study of natural resources is being discussed currently.

I would also like to devote certain attention to the difficulties being encountered by the United Nations in its activity pertaining to global problems. These difficulties may conditionally be subdivided into two groups. Entirely objective factors are the basis of the first, the second is connected with the foreign policy aims of states which in their approach to international affairs generally and the solution of global problems in particular base themselves on narrow class and egotistical interests and give preference to "power diplomacy" methods to the detriment of honest, equal cooperation which is profitable for all.

There is no doubt that international cooperation on global problems, particularly within the framework of intergovernmental organizations of a universal composition, encounters a number of difficulties of an objective nature--the novelty and large-scale nature of the objects of cooperation; the high degree of the political content of both the global problems themselves and of states' interaction in solving them; the far from identical manifestation and perception of these problems in different countries and the multiplicity of evaluations of the paths and means of solving them; the combination of national and universal interests; and so forth.

There is no more obvious truth than that the arms race, which has undergone a new acceleration now as a result of the aspiration of the NATO powers to military superiority, is not only making the solution of global problems

extraordinarily more difficult but leading to their exacerbation. Is a display of interest in peaceful cooperation in space and the oceans to be expected on the part of powers thinking solely about deploying a tremendous quantity of various types of arms there? Does the creation of a RDF and its use in a number of parts of the world not testify to the NATO countries' complete disregard for the search for solutions of fuel-raw material problems on the paths of mutually profitable cooperation?

Recently the United States and some of its allies have been making unceremonious attempts against the very infrastructure of the international cooperation of states with different social systems. These have included the breakdown of the North-South talks, refusal to sign the Law of the Sea Convention, limitation of scientific-technical relations with the socialist countries and a number of other similar measures. The same goals are pursued by improper actions in respect of the United Nations being undertaken by imperialist powers--malicious attacks on and insulting statements against it in the course of the last General Assembly session, the creation of a spirit of confrontation at UN forums and attempts to put crude pressure on individual institutions of the UN system (UNESCO and UNCTAD, for example).

The campaign developed in the West in respect of the United Nations is being painfully reflected in its activity in the sphere of global problems. Thus, for example, certain Western countries have either reduced the amount of their contributions to the UN Environment Program or are delaying payments to it. The notorious "linkage" policy is being practical. In particular, with the manifest intention of ensuring the "demonstration effect" of its action the United States declined to associate itself with a regional plan for conservation of the environment of the Caribbean inasmuch as Cuba is participating.

The policy of antidependence and sabotage of the collective efforts to safeguard the common interests of all mankind being made by the UN system are undoubtedly creating many difficulties on the way to overcoming the global contradictions in world development.

For this reason a task of paramount importance confronting multilateral diplomacy in the sphere of global studies is the mobilization of all healthy and honest forces in the United Nations which support a democratic solution of global problems. Joint actions aimed at an increase in the authority of this forum and its influence and at active opposition to the destructive policy of the NATO powers must play a decisive part here.

G. Zhukov: Elimination of the Vestiges of Colonialism

The UN Charter and the Declaration on Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (subsequently the decolonization declaration), which was adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1960 on the initiative of the USSR, create the necessary basis in international law for the struggle to remove the vestiges of colonialism.

Currently all colonial and other nonself-governing territories are in the possession of five states--Britain, the United States, France, Australia and New Zealand. South Africa, which pursues a policy of apartheid and is illegally retaining within its power the territory of Namibia, should be added to this list.

In spite of the manifold UN General Assembly decisions, the colonial powers are not implementing the due measures aimed at the formation of the independent existence of the small island territories in the Pacific, Atlantic and Indian oceans and in the Caribbean. In addition, the administering powers are using these territories for military purposes. They are doing everything to preserve the bases which they have set up on the islands of Guam, Puerto Rico, Diego Garcia, the Bermudas, the Turks and Caicos islands in the Pacific (Micronesia) and on other territories. The presence of military bases, primarily American, is not only a principal obstacle in the way of the exercise by the peoples of these territories of the right to self-determination and independence but is also leading to the emergence of new centers of tension.

A special Security Council session was convened in April 1981 on the initiative of a group of African states in connection with the racist South African regime's refusal to implement the said resolutions. A number of resolutions was submitted for its examination which proposed the imposition of all-embracing mandatory sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the UN Charter. However, not one was passed owing to the veto on the part of the United States, Britain and France.

The UN General Assembly Eighth Special Session was held in September 1981 in connection with the critical situation in Namibia and the blocking by the United States, Britain and France of the Security Council's adoption of mandatory sanctions against South Africa. It called on the Security Council to respond positively to the demand of the overwhelming majority of the international community for the urgent imposition of all-embracing mandatory sanctions against South Africa and proposed that all states cease immediately, individually and collectively, all relations with South Africa in order to completely isolate it politically, economically, militarily and culturally and also proposed that the Council for Namibia monitor observance of the boycott of South Africa.

Back in the 1960's Washington, having assessed the military-strategic significance of Micronesia, began to implement measures to actually annex it. For this the status of "free association" with the United States was proposed to the Micronesians. Having encountered the people's resistance, the United States took the path of dismemberment of the trust territory, fragmenting it into four administered parts.

The United States' actions in respect of Micronesia represent a serious threat to peace and security in the Pacific and are leading to the creation of a dangerous center of tension. From the viewpoint of international law such unilateral actions by the United States are illegitimate since they are contrary to the UN Charter, the trusteeship agreement between the Security Council and the United States and the 1960 UN decolonization declaration.

The United States' behavior is manifestly contrary to the UN Charter, which directly stipulates that any change in the status of a "strategic trust territory" must only be effected in accordance with a Security Council decision. The United States' actions in communiting a strategic trust territory in circumvention of the Security Council are illegal in this respect. Yet it is well known that in the above-mentioned declaration the UN General Assembly condemned "all attempts aimed at the partial or complete disruption of the national unity and territorial integrity of colonial territories." The United States has been making efforts throughout recent years to impede discussion of the Micronesia question at UN General Assembly sessions. This is being done on the pretext that the question of Micronesia is only within the competence of the Security Council. The United States remains deliberately silent here about the fact that it is a question of a decolonization problem which the General Assembly, in accordance with article 10 of the UN Charter and the decolonization declaration, has been discussing for a long time. The General Assembly's examination of this question must not, of course, undermine the prerogatives of the Security Council in respect of this territory.

As a member of the Trusteeship Council and the Security Council, the USSR constantly draws the attention of the United Nations to the fate of the Pacific Islands (Micronesia) Trust Territory. They cannot be permitted to be annexed by the United States and to become a virtual colony under the signboard of "free association" of "commonwealth".

Under these conditions the United Nations must adopt all necessary measures to ensure the fulfillment by the administering power, that is, the United States, of its commitments, cut short the attempt to confront the world with the fait accompli of the complete absorption of the trust territory and help its people exercise their legitimate right to create a united independent state.

The United Nations is called on to speed up the liberation of all small, colonial territories and contribute to the removal of all obstacles in the way of the colonial peoples' movement toward freedom and independence.

I. Dyumulen: Reorganization of International Economic Relations

In recent decades, particularly since the mid-1960's, an increasingly important place in UN activity has been occupied by international economic problems. A central one among them is the comprehensive problem which has come to be called the reorganization of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis.

An intensive political struggle is under way in UN bodies on questions of the reorganization of international economic relations, in the course of which the socialist countries are advocating the creation of firm democratic and equal foundations of international economic cooperation. At the same time, however, this is also a most acute area of the developing countries' present-day struggle against neocolonialism which unfolded in the United Nations as of the start of the 1970's under the slogan of a new international economic order (NIEO). The NIEO idea proceeds directly or indirectly from the need to put an end to the legacy of the period of colonial domination and to remove the barriers in the way of an acceleration of the socioeconomic progress of the developing

countries, which were subject in the past to ruthless exploitation and plunder.

Specifically, the developing countries are insisting on a revision for this purpose of the principles and rules of international trade and a reform of certain existing international institutions, primarily the GATT; normalization of international raw materials trade; and so forth.

Following the creation of the United Nations, our country continued to persistently seek a reorganization of international economic relations on new just principles.

It is significant that many of the proposals pertaining to a reorganization of international economic relations made by the developing countries have their sources in the proposals of the Soviet Union and the socialist community countries advanced by them at various times in the United Nations.

"The reorganization of international economic relations on a democratic basis and on the principles of equality is historically logical," the CPSU Central Committee report to the 26th party congress observed. "Much can and must be done here. We are ready to contribute and are in practice contributing to the establishment of just international economic relations." The Soviet Union has been guided by this high-minded policy in the course of the many complex negotiations initiated in the United Nations in the 1970's and 1980's. However, realization of the NIEO ideas and economic decolonization has encountered the stubborn opposition of the developed capitalist countries, primarily the United States, which have begun a counteroffensive against the developing countries and are impeding the development, adoption and realization of the proposals which the latter are putting forward.

The sharp deterioration in the international atmosphere in the 1980's through the fault of U.S. imperialist circles has created serious obstacles in the way of a reorganization of international economic relations on a just basis and delayed implementation of the decisions already adopted in this sphere.

Examining the prospects, it is necessary for this reason to take account of the inseparable interconnection between progress in this sphere and the political climate in the world. As experience shows, it is detente which creates the most favorable conditions for the struggle being conducted by the socialist and developing countries for the reorganization of international economic relations.

A. Kodachenko: The United Nation's International Development Strategy

As of the 1960's decade programs have been developed within the framework of international development strategy (IDS), which records the most important quantitative and qualitative goals and means of socioeconomic progress of the developing world. IDS for the third decade--the 1980's--is being reviewed and evaluated currently. The idea of such strategy emerged in circles of the progressive world community under the influence of the serious concern for the fate of the socioeconomic progress of Asian, African and Latin American developing countries. Owing to the more than modest results of IDS decades I and II, they were rightly evaluated as programs of "growth without development".

A new element of IDS in decade III is the proclaimed task of a reorganization of the entire system of the developing countries' relations with the Western powers on more equal and just principles, in accordance with the NIEO idea adopted by the United Nations in 1974.

Particular emphasis should be put on the development of the scientific-technical base for the creation of such leading sectors of the economy as electronics, chemistry, engineering and others, which would make it possible to organize the production of modern producer goods on the scale necessary for the modernization of the whole economy. The success of IDS is also inseparable from the implementation of internal radical socioeconomic transformations.

Neocolonialist circles of the West have attempted to impose on the developing countries--on the pretext of the adoption of special measures for combating starvation and poverty--the "basic needs" concept, in accordance with which the implementation of IDS should be reoriented toward the creation not of independent national economic complexes but mainly the production of food and industrial consumer goods satisfying merely the most urgent and minimum needs of the population. According to the designs of the apologists of neocolonialism, socioeconomic development strategy should be geared mainly to the development of export production and the adaptation of the developing countries' economy to the needs and requirements of the developed capitalist countries in accordance with the "growing interdependence" concept. Realization of the "basic needs" idea, despite the demagogic, propagandist camouflage, would thereby signify essentially conservation of the economic backwardness and dependence of the developing countries within the framework of the world capitalist economic system, albeit with somewhat more acceptable social conditions.

The developing countries' struggle for realization of the aims of the United Nations' IDS for the 1980's is being facilitated appreciably by the firm and consistent support of the USSR and the entire socialist community. As emphasized in the 20 October 1983 communique of the 37th CEMA Session, the socialist CEMA states together with the nonaligned countries "emphatically condemn all forms of economic aggression and attempts to use economic relations as a means of political pressure and interference in states' internal affairs. They support the developing countries' progressive demands for a reorganization of international economic relations on an equal and democratic basis and the establishment of a just international economic order, including the speediest start in the United Nations on global negotiations on the most urgent world economic problems in accordance with UN General Assembly decisions." It was emphasized at the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum that the Soviet Union would continue to pursue a policy of mutually profitable cooperation with states freed from colonial and semicolonial dependence, with full respect for their sovereignty.

Yu. Kashlev: The International Significance and Nature of Information

The problems and principles of the international exchange of information are being discussed increasingly often and increasingly sharply at UN General Assembly sessions and forums of UNESCO, the International Telecommunications Union and other institutions. Various resolutions and other documents are being adopted on these questions and a wide-ranging discussion is being

conducted around the idea of a new international information order which has been put forward by the developing countries.

On the initiative of the Soviet Union and with the support of the developing countries the Declaration on the Basic Principles Concerning the Mass Media's Contribution to the Strengthening of Peace and International Mutual Understanding, the Development of Human Rights and the Struggle Against Racism, Apartheid and Incitement to War was successfully adopted in UNESCO in 1978. This is the first document in UN history which emphasizes so definitely states' obligation to use the information media in the interests of peace and mutual understanding. The declaration mentions the task of assistance to the developing countries for the purpose of the creation of their own national information systems and the establishment of more equal relations in the sphere of the international exchange of information.

Many specific questions concerning information have been examined at UN General Assembly sessions, which have passed the corresponding resolutions. The 37th Session (1982), for example, approved a resolution on the regulation of states' use of artificial Earth satellites for direct television broadcasting. The document contains useful provisions echoing a draft convention on this question submitted to the United Nations by the Soviet Union back in 1972. Great significance is attached, in particular, to the clause to the effect that for the organization of television via satellite to this state or the other it is essential to obtain its consent. The representatives of the United States and its NATO allies and certain other capitalist countries, who champion their corporations' "right" to broadcast to any country at their discretion, objected sharply to this principle. This approach was rejected by the majority of delegations.

The socialist and many developing countries advocated stimulation of UN efforts in support of a new information order and the extension of assistance in the sphere of mass communications to the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. They approved the activity of UNESCO and the International Communications Development Program set up under its aegis, within the framework of which resources are being mobilized for assistance to the developing countries in the creation of national information bodies and the training of personnel. As far as the Western states, particularly the United States, are concerned, they attempted to muffle the discussion, which was of an anti-imperialist nature as a whole, and remove from the discussion the problem of a new information order and imposed the "free flow of information" idea.

And on another question also--concerning the work of the United Nations Public Information Department--the divide ran between the same groups of countries. The socialist and developing states supported the corresponding services of the Secretariat and the United Nations' information centers (they exist in 64 states) informing the public more extensively and better about the activity and decisions of the United Nations in support of peace, disarmament, decolonization and so forth, while the representatives of the United States and certain other Western countries excelled in attacks on the Public Information Department and in fact demanded a reduction in its activity.

A report on the attitude toward the United Nations of the world community submitted by the Secretariat caused a particularly stormy reaction among Western delegations. The report observed that in view of the unobjective illustration by Western mass media and government circles of this organization's activity a negative attitude toward it is increasing among the public of Western countries. At the same time, however, thanks to the objective supply of material by the mass media of the socialist states, the report emphasizes, the United Nations enjoys extensive recognition in these states. As was to have been expected, the Western delegations rained down a shower of charges concerning the report's "lack of balance" and "lack of objectivity," demanding that it be recalled. However, the majority of delegations supported the report's basic conclusions and the proposals contained therein.

Attempting to frustrate the constructive work of the Committee for Information, the United States also objected to an expansion of the United Nations' information activity. Because of this many specific recommendations made by the developing countries were passed on for examination by the General Assembly 38th Session in uncoordinated form. Having voted against the "Questions Concerning Information" resolution (there were 135 votes for), the United States once again demonstrated its unwillingness to come to terms with the opinion of the world community and the interests of the developing countries, which are demanding the decolonization and democratization of international information exchange.

The world community perceived as a provocative step the United States' decision to withdraw from UNESCO in 1984. And it is not so much a question here of this organization's support for a new international information order as of the fact that it had begun to condemn U.S. policy on many other questions also with increasing frequency. Washington's action was evaluated by the vast majority of states as intolerable blackmail and an unconcealed method of "power diplomacy".

Upon discussion of problems of information at all international forums, including the United Nations and its bodies, the Soviet Union invariably champions the need for the use of the powerful potential of the mass media in the interests of peace, mutual understanding and the progress of the peoples. The ideological-political differences between socialism and imperialism which objectively exist must not be translated into psychological warfare and subversive propaganda nor must the press, radio and television be used to spur tension and justify military preparations and the arms race. Yet it is for precisely these purposes that a huge propaganda machinery has been created and is operating in the West, round-the-clock subversive broadcasting from such centers as Radios Liberty and Free Europe is conducted against the socialist countries and new stations, like the American Radio Marti for broadcasting against Cuba, are being created.

Great harm is being done to the cause of peace, mutual understanding and cooperation by Western propaganda's spreading of propositions concerning the "permissibility" of nuclear war, the possibility of winning such, the "advantages" of "clean" weapons of the neutron type and so forth. The campaign of falsification on the theme of the "Soviet military threat" has assumed tremendous proportions.

Soviet Leaders have repeatedly emphatically condemned such actions and this has been mentioned repeatedly from the UN platform. The Warsaw Pact Political Declaration adopted in 1983 in Prague emphasized the need for the dissemination of truthful information and a renunciation of chauvinist and militarist propaganda and attempts to teach other peoples how to order their life. The use of such powerful instruments of influencing people's minds and shaping public opinion as the press, radio and television for slander and disinformation and the incitement of alienation and hatred between peoples was resolutely condemned. The principles enshrined in the UN Charter, the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the UNESCO declaration on the mass media should extend in full to the sphere of information.

V. Vislykh: For the Rational Use of the United Nations' Budget Resources

The United Nations began its work in 1946 with a budget of \$19.4 million. UN expenditure for the current year is set at \$793.6 million. Is the more than 40-fold increase in the UN budget in the 38 years of its existence justified, does it testify to a commensurate expansion of activity and its increased efficiency?

Of course, the sphere of UN activity has expanded appreciably in the said period, which has required that new resources be found for efficient functioning and the performance of statutory tasks. However, this is not the sole and not even the main reason for such a surging growth of the UN budget. It is primarily a question of a considerable increase therein in the proportion of resources spent on purposes not directly related to the organization's main statutory task--maintaining international peace and security. Thus of the appropriations approved for 1984, almost three-fourths are absorbed by the United Nations' socioeconomic subdivisions, and only 6 percent of the resources will be allocated for material support for the United Nations' political functions connected with peacekeeping.

Motivated by concern for an increase in the effectiveness of the United Nations as an important instrument of maintaining international peace and security, the Soviet Union consistently advocates that at the center of its attention be questions of the prevention of nuclear catastrophe and disarmament problems. Accordingly, in the UN budget also the predominant positions should be occupied by items of expenditure on financing the subdivision of the organization engaged in solving precisely such problems. Proceeding from this, the USSR deems it necessary that UN expenditure in the socioeconomic sphere be frozen at the present level and that all new spheres of the organization's activity not connected with the performance of its key task be financed from resources released as a result of the completion, reduction, reorganization and other changes to programs of the Secretariat. The need for the adoption of decisive measures to limit the further swelling of the UN budget is also recognized by the majority of other states which make large contributions to it.

Objecting to the spending of its contributions on a growing scale on types of activity not connected with the performance of the tasks for which the organization was created, even less can the Soviet Union agree to their use for purposes directly contrary to the charter. Yet the UN budget retains as a

legacy from the times of the cold war an item for covering expenditure brought about by UN operations in the Near East and the Congo in violation of the charter in the 1950's and 1960's. The USSR does not intend to bear any responsibility for them and together with a large group of other states does not participate in their financing.

V. Petrovskiy: Effective Instrument of General Security

As already observed in the course of this colloquium, the United Nations represents a unique forum of the interaction of many states. It now incorporates 158 countries. Its bodies discuss practically all important questions of the present day, whose range extends from the law of the sea to space, from removal of the nuclear threat to putting an end to the trade in narcotics, women and children and from the reorganization of international economic relations on just principles to the struggle against starvation in the developing world. The agenda of the recent General Assembly 38th Session contained 146 points and took up several dozen pages. In the course of the session there were 510 official sittings, not to mention numerous unofficial consultations and contacts along the lines of regional groups of states and on a bilateral basis. The Security Council met 98 times throughout 1983. In this period 456 resolutions were passed by the General Assembly and 17 by the Security Council.

These statistical indicators alone attest states' increased attention to the United Nations and the endeavor of the majority of them to find answers with the help of this organization to their concerns and cherished hopes. In other words, the intensive and multifaceted work of the United Nations is contributing to broad international interaction, and, furthermore, and this is particularly important, not interaction of the billiard balls type, when the angle of incidence is equal to the angle of reflection, but interaction within the framework of the aims, principles and rules determined by the organization's charter.

These UN functions are of considerable positive significance under current conditions, when aggressive imperialist circles, primarily in the United States, are attempting to break up the generally recognized standards of international behavior and are implementing in practice a doctrine of international plunder. In the course of the General Assembly 38th Session the United States failed to put forward a single constructive proposal, voted against all the most important initiatives, whether they concerned a lessening of the nuclear threat, the Palestinian problem or the liquidation of the vestiges of colonialism, and justified its actions entailing a threat to peace.

This brings us to the main question--the nature of states' interaction in the United Nations. As is known, interaction is destructive and creative and in the form of struggle and mutual repulsion and, on the contrary, in the form of unification, mutual support and mutual stimulation. All forms of interaction are observed in the United Nations reflecting, albeit not smoothly, in general outline correctly, the state of current interstate relations. And if states' interaction within the United Nations has a vector with a plus sign, the decisive credit for this belongs to the Soviet state.

In the face of the provocative confrontational actions of imperialism the Soviet Union, demonstrating firmness and restraint, energetically insists on the joint efforts of all states, irrespective of the differences and contradictions between them, in tackling the said task. Such is the demand of reason, which alone can and must protect mankind from catastrophe. A responsible approach to the fate of peace and political realism in the true meaning of this word are more essential today than ever.

The results of the UN General Assembly 38th Session attest the effectiveness of the policy line championed by the Soviet Union. The session not only correctly reflected as a whole the endeavor of the overwhelming majority of states to prevent the insanity of nuclear extermination but recommended specific actions for the achievement of this goal and for the strengthening of peace and the restoration of trust and mutual understanding. Approval of the declaration condemning nuclear war and the resolutions on a nuclear arms freeze and the prevention of an arms race in space, which were developed on the initiative and with the active participation of the USSR and the other socialist countries, are a convincing indication of this. Only the United States and its closest allies voted against.

The UN Charter clearly and definitely sets the task of the achievement of disarmament. This question as a whole and individual aspects thereof are discussed and states' views on it are expounded at regular sessions of the General Assembly and in the First (political) Committee. At the 38th session this committee examined approximately one-fourth of all points on the agenda. The first special session of the General Assembly devoted solely to questions of disarmament was held in 1978. It was unprecedented in terms of the composition of the participants and breadth of coverage and depth of study of problems by the forum of states. In spite of the "West's" opposition, a generally acceptable final document was successfully coordinated thereat which not only emphasizes that the task of preventing nuclear war, easing the nuclear threat and achieving disarmament is goal No 1 in current international politics but also outlines a broad range of approaches to the solution of specific questions connected with this.

The special session initiated the holding of such forums on a regular basis. The second such session was held 4 years later, in 1982, and the convening of the third is planned in 1986. As the results of the second session show, it is not a question of this mechanism of examination or the other of this urgent problem. The problem consists of the existence of the UN members' political will. Availing themselves of the principle of the achievement of general assent (consensus), at the second special session the United States and its NATO allies frustrated the adoption of a comprehensive summary document. Nonetheless, the mere fact that it took place and also the fact that states continue to attach paramount significance to the said set of problems says much. Nor can this be ignored in the capitals of the Western powers. The mass demonstrations conducted during the second special session, including the more than 700,000-strong demonstration of peace supporters in New York, were eloquent testimony to the same thing.

The aims and principles of the United Nations and the positive decisions which it adopts, which are of high moral-political authority, are a reliable reference point for seeking and finding generally acceptable solutions at all other international forums. They also serve as a beacon for the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Cooperation in Europe. This theme was raised in the speeches of many delegates at General Assembly sessions and also in connection with the need for the creation of a favorable climate for taking actual steps to curb the arms race and for disarmament. The historic commitment of the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons was regarded at the 38th Session as a most important confidence-building measure. A direct appeal to the NATO nuclear states was made in the resolution specially adopted on this question that they undertake, in accordance with the USSR's example, not to be the first to use such weapons.

In conclusion I would like to draw attention to the need for the active use in scientific, scientific-propaganda and lecture work of useful UN decisions. They should not merely become the property of the archives and gather dust on shelves. We should appeal to them as the expression of the will of the overwhelming majority of states and all peoples of the world. It is toward this that we are oriented by the USSR Supreme Soviet edict "The International Situation and the Soviet Union's Foreign Policy," which expresses profound satisfaction at the UN General Assembly's approval of responsible decisions on proposals of the USSR and declares a readiness to study measures pertaining to the realization of such decisions, if the United States and other NATO countries are ready for this.

And one further point. As was correctly noted in the course of the discussion, a huge "expanse of information" has been accumulated which is frequently used unscrupulously by certain political and scientific circles in the West. Of course, we cannot deny the significance of its systematization and processing with the aid of the latest methods and research modes, which could be a considerable help in an analysis of UN activity. At the same time, however, it would be an exaggeration to categorically claim that such a procedure and methods could ascertain both the specific regularities of UN activity and the measures which would contribute to an increase in the organization's peacekeeping role. No theoretical outlines can substitute for a content analysis of the policy of member-states in respect of the United Nations, a policy which is a decisive factor in the efficient functioning of the organization in all areas of activity, primarily in the sphere of maintaining international peace and security. Bringing states' policy into line with the demands of the UN Charter--such is a categorical imperative of our time.

The essence of our approach to the United Nations is expressed in A.A. Gromyko's words to the UN participants: "It is more important today than ever that UN members recognize themselves in full as united nations--united by a resolve to act to save the present and future generations from nuclear annihilation."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/10

SOVIET-FRENCH SYMPOSIUM ON ECONOMIC, TECHNICAL COOPERATION

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNNYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6, Jun 84 pp 141-142

[A. Kudryavtsev report: "Soviet-French Symposium"]

[Text] Paris--The third Soviet-French scientific symposium, which was organized by the Center for Study of the Economy of the Socialist Countries at the Sorbonne (Prof M. [Lavin'], leader) and devoted to bilateral economic cooperation, was held recently in Paris. Workers of research establishments and foreign trade departments and employees of the embassy and commercial office of the USSR and scientists and representatives of the civil service and business and banking circles of France took part. The symposium was attended by Yu. Vorontsov, ambassador of the USSR in France.

The participants in the symposium discussed three groups of questions of the greatest theoretical and practical interest for the current stage of bilateral relations: an analysis of the particular features of the foreign trade relations of France and the USSR in 1982-1983; an evaluation of the possibilities of cooperation in the agrarian-industrial sphere; ways of improving the institutional-legal basis of economic cooperation.

In his introductory remarks I. Gur'yev, the head of the Soviet delegation and deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economy and International Relations (IMEMO), emphasized that the present meeting was taking place against the background of a sharp deterioration in the international situation caused by the start of the implementation of NATO's "rearmament" plans. In recent years a negative impression on East-West economic relations, including Soviet-French economic relations, has been made by a number of objective processes which have unfolded in the capitalist economy--the lengthy crisis, the increased cost of credit and increased protectionism. Subjective factors also--the attempts of the ruling circles of a number of capitalist states, primarily the United States, to regulate the structure of Soviet exports and imports by way of a policy of sanctions and embargoes--have also played their part.

The Soviet Union consistently advocates the development on a nondiscriminatory basis of international economic relations between states belonging to different social systems. As I. Gur'yev emphasized, this contributes to the acceleration

of the progress of the production forces and is of considerable political significance in an atmosphere of intensified struggle for peace and security.

V. Kuznetsov (USSR Academy of Sciences IMEMO) and A. Lisov (the USSR Commercial Office in Paris) from the Soviet side and J.-C. (Pey) (Ministry of External Relations), A. le (Korr) (Ministry of Economy, Finance and Budget) and J. (Vil'd) (Planning Commissariat Center for International Information and Forecasting) from the French side spoke on the first group of questions. The speakers noted the essential singularities of the two countries' foreign trade relations in the past 2-3 years: an increase in the unevenness of the dynamics of commodity turnover, the transition of a surplus in favor of France to a surplus in favor of the USSR, a reduction in the proportion of machinery and equipment in French exports and an increase in the proportion of energy carriers, primarily petroleum raw material and petroleum products, in Soviet exports, and others.

In the opinion of Soviet participants in the symposium, a negative influence on bilateral trade was also exerted by the general decline in the competitiveness of French products on world markets, which entailed an increase in France's foreign trade and payments deficit with its partners in the period 1981-1983; the West's standardization of guaranteed state export credit rates, which caused complications when it came to financing French large-scale projects; and the slow expansion of the list of Soviet commodities exported to France. The increased control over new equipment and technology exports for the socialist countries' civil needs could have extremely unfavorable consequences for bilateral cooperation.

The Soviet participants in the symposium did not agree with the opinion of some speakers, who claimed that the USSR had slackened efforts aimed at the development of economic cooperation with the West, particularly with France. On the contrary, the Soviet side demonstrated a readiness to meet its partner half-way on such a question as the French deficit with the USSR. As a result of the accords reached at the time of the work of the Grand Commission in 1982 and 1983 the size of the deficit was halved in just 1 year by way of accelerated Soviet purchases of agricultural products and consumer goods in France.

The speeches of the French participants in the symposium on the first group of questions evoked great interest. J.-C. (Pey) emphasized, inter alia, that political differences must not impede the expansion of economic relations. A certain optimism, he said, is also implanted by the readiness expressed by both sides to link scientific-technical cooperation more closely with industrial-economic cooperation and bring it to the point of specific foreign trade results. "We do not wish to remain in fifth place in trade with the USSR," declared A. le (Korr), who listed many areas where, he believes, there are favorable prospects for the expansion of trade and scientific-technical cooperation. And even J. (Vil'd), who does not, in his words, share the "undue optimism," agreed when making his evaluation of the prospects for bilateral economic relations that "nor are there particular grounds for pessimism."

A round table of the participants in and guests of the symposium chaired by R. Violo (president of the French Companie frigorifique) was conducted in respect of the second group of questions--trade-economic cooperation in the sphere of the agrarian-industrial complex. Papers were presented by V. Morozov (IMEMO), C. (Bokur) (Center for International Information and Forecasting) and (V. Andreff) (Grenoble University).

The recently adopted Food Program through 1990, V. Morozov observed, is aimed at the comprehensive accomplishment of such tasks as the balance of production and public demand for high-quality food products and the country's self-sufficiency in the most important agricultural resources and, in respect of some of them, a gradual buildup of exports. While giving priority to a further increase in national production the Soviet Union does not intend to renounce foreign trade to supplement food stocks and accelerate scientific-technical progress in the agrarian-industrial complex sectors.

The current stage of the USSR's foreign-economic relations with the developed capitalist countries following the failure of the attempts of some of them to use trade in foodstuffs as an instrument of blackmail is characterized by two trends. First of all there is a reorientation of food imports toward a larger number of exporters and then an expansion of imports not so much of food as of means of production for all spheres of the agrarian-industrial complex. In this sphere economic relations between the USSR and France--West Europe's biggest agrarian power--have not yet been sufficiently extensively developed. In V. Morozov's opinion, potential for a further development of cooperation is to be found primarily in the sphere of production of producer goods for agriculture and also equipment for food transportation, storage and marketing.

The papers of the French scientists provided a detailed and cogent analysis of the state of the world food, agricultural equipment and fertilizer markets and highlighted the particular features of Soviet-French trade in these commodities. As a whole, the speakers emphasized, it is essential to be oriented toward the mutually profitable exchange of products and experience in both directions--from France to the USSR and from the USSR to France, clearing away all artificial obstacles.

A legal basis of bilateral relations which is as a whole dependable and which has justified itself institutionally has been created in the past 20 years of active Soviet-French economic cooperation. The papers of M. Boguslavskiy (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of State and Law), J. (Byurdo) (Dijon University) and P. (Shar'ye) (French Foreign Trade Bank) were devoted to ways of further improving it.

The USSR and France, M. Boguslavskiy said, have succeeded in creating a mechanism of cooperation which makes it possible to take account of the fundamental distinction of the national economic systems. It has served as a prototype for similar forms in relations between other socialist and capitalist states. In the speaker's opinion, the new conditions and prospects demand a strengthening of the role of contractual practice.

J. (Byurdo) dwelt on the particular features of the contractual relations which have taken shape between French enterprises and Soviet foreign trade organizations.

She observed that the French firms which maintain stable relations with the USSR and notify the Soviet foreign trade establishments concerned in advance of their potential are in the best position from the viewpoint of their involvement in commercial contracts. The Soviet side's strict fulfillment of all points of the contracts represents, J. (Byurdo) believes, an indisputable advantage for French suppliers.

In the course of discussion of this group of papers the Soviet delegation advocated the speediest settlement of the urgent problems of the extension of mutual trade credit. It is no secret that it is precisely the fact that they are unsolved which has put France in a disadvantageous position compared with the capitalist countries on whose money markets lower interest rates have operated. It has been a reason for the slowing in French exports to the USSR. In turn, the representatives of France's business circles expressed the wish that the risk and expenditure connected with French firms' preliminary estimates and the development of industrial projects be duly taken into consideration in commercial contracts.

The meeting confirmed that opportunities exist for a further expansion of commercial-economic relations between the USSR and France and revealed a mutual interest in the development of cooperation.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850
CSO: 1816/10

DEVELOPMENT OF U.S. 'PHILOSOPHY OF STRENGTH' REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6, Jun 84 pp 143-145

[V. Karpukhin, Ya. Povarkov review: "Groundless Basis"]

[Text] The United States' postwar foreign policy can hardly be put among the little-developed subjects of scientific research. Nonetheless, the author of the book in question,* the well-known Soviet American-specialist historian, has managed to find a new angle of study of this seemingly well-studied subject. On the basis of a vast amount of material, including little-known documentary and archive material, he analyzes the bourgeois "philosophy of strength" and its use as the basis of the foreign policy practice of American imperialism since World War II.

The book begins with the interesting observation: "strength" is the favorite word in America's foreign policy lexicon. Thus in an election statement in 1980 the former U.S. President J. Carter contrived to use this word five times in a single sentence. Peace, he declared, must be based "on strength, a strength whose existence does not need to be specially proved, a strength which simply exists, a strength recognized by other countries and other peoples, a strength recognized by us ourselves" (p 3).

Representatives of the present U.S. Administration also speak candidly and bellicosely about strength as the basis of their foreign policy. Negotiations and agreements "from a position of strength," "revival of America's greatness with the aid of strength," achievement of "superior strength," "ensuring security through increased strength"--these and similar expressions are encountered in virtually every speech of Washington leaders, primarily R. Reagan himself.

The cult of strength has long been a part of the flesh and blood of American imperialism, which quickly and thoroughly assimilated, as V.I. Lenin observed, "the essence of international relations under capitalism: open plunder of

* Yu.M. Mel'nikov, "Sila i bessiliye: vneshnyaya politika Vashingtona. 1945-1982" [Strength and Impotence: Washington's Foreign Policy. 1945-1982], Moscow, Izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury, 1983, p 368.

the weak...."** Examining the genesis of Washington's postwar foreign policy in the introduction, Yu. Mel'nikov writes that at the turn of the century even "the supporters of gunboat diplomacy, that is, reliance primarily and mostly on military strength for accomplishing the expansionist designs of the U.S. ruling elite, occupied, together with the apologists of dollar diplomacy, the leading place in the formation of its imperialist ideology and policy" (p 6).

The alliance of the sword and the dollar is a principle reason for the openly power nature of the foreign policy of, as V.I. Lenin put it, the youngest and most predatory, American, imperialism. As the monograph observes, it is precisely to the start of the 20th century, to the time of President T. Roosevelt, who formulated the "big stick policy" in Latin America," that "we should also attribute the start of the formation of the closest alliance and merger of the interests and activity of the American monopolists and militarists, which comparatively quickly became one of the most ominous associations in the history of the United States and all mankind" (ibid.).

This alliance, which much later came to be called the military-industrial complex, has determined the basic content and main directions of the foreign policy of American imperialism for all subsequent decades. Its essence was expressed by President W. Wilson even, who declared that "a mature United States must assume the burden of governing the world!" (ibid.). In other words, the United States declared its aspiration to world domination back at the dawn of the century.

These ambitious calculations were overturned by the Great October Socialist Revolution, which marked the start of a new historical era, which made fundamental changes to the sphere of international relations also. The young Soviet republic born of October rejected the "philosophy of strength" and emphatically condemned the imperialist policy of aggression and wars, putting forward as a counterweight to it the principle of peaceful coexistence between states. At the same time it was forced from the very outset to defend itself and counterpose to enemies its revolutionary strength. Neither imperialist intervention, economic blockade nor the horde of the most terrible handiwork of the 20th century--Hitler fascism--which unleashed World War II, were able to drive out the victorious revolution, which was nurtured primarily by the advantages of the new, progressive system.

However, American imperialism, which immediately following the October Revolution elevated anti-Sovietism and anticomunism to the level of official policy, was unwilling to come to terms with the lessons of history. And following World War II also the United States' practice of the use of, threat and show of armed force was developed against a background of avowed power doctrines and concepts, to an analysis of which the monograph in question is to a considerable extent devoted. Even before the end of the war, after the death of President F.D. Roosevelt, with whose name, as the author observes, the

* V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 20, p 245.

most realistic period in the history of Washington's foreign policy is connected, the new American leadership headed by H. Truman adopted a policy of confrontation with the USSR and began to prepare for the cold war, the initial stage of which was "atomic diplomacy"--the American doctrine of atomic blackmail in the international arena.

The ideological basis of and cover for this aggressive policy was the so-called "containment" doctrine, which portrayed the United States' own expansionist actions in the form of "retaliatory," "defensive" measures. "While asserting as a goal of American foreign policy the preservation of 'world stability' and the 'status quo'," the book says, "it was ultimately aimed at suppression of the world revolutionary movement and the destruction of the USSR and the other socialist states" (p 33). In other words, this doctrine was aimed, in Marx's expression, against the "movement of history," which to the power politics of the United States counterposed the strength of world socialism and the international workers and national liberation movements.

The end of the United States' atomic monopoly and the failure of the policy based on the so-called "containment" doctrine did not discourage Washington. Under the conditions of the cold war unleashed by American imperialism and the orgy of militarism and McCarthyism many of the foreign policy defeats of the H. Truman administration were criticized within the country as a policy that was too "weak," "passive" and "defensive" and "unsuccessful precisely because of this". As Yu. Mel'nikov emphasizes, individual support for a reduction in the "power tension" in international relations "was countered by a strong and well-organized and financed campaign not only for the continuation of the basic reliance on military, atomic power... but also for a further increase therein" (p 86).

The Eisenhower-Dulles administration, which replaced the H. Truman administration in 1953, attempted to justify the race for superior military strength with even more provocative foreign policy doctrines--"liberation" and "massive retribution". The United States essentially declared officially that it was prepared to unleash thermonuclear war in the struggle against world socialism and for the achievement of its hegemonist goals. The book shows convincingly that the preparations for "total war" and the "total diplomacy" persistently pursued by Washington, which insisted on Dulles' pact-mania, in practice contributed to the undermining of American imperialism's own positions. Ultimately the latter's gamble on a power confrontation with the Soviet Union led by the end of the 1950's-start of the 1960's even to a qualitative change in the correlation of forces in the world arena.

A sobering up from the illusions of the "greatness and impunity" of American strength and a certain reassessment and reorientation of Washington's foreign and military policy occurred under President J. Kennedy, particularly following the so-called Caribbean crisis. "Although recognition of the 'inconceivability' of a thermonuclear war with the USSR had long since arisen in Washington," the book says, "nonetheless, it was in the October days of 1962, when the deadly breath of such a war wafted for the first time, perhaps, over the United States, that commonsensical Americans finally understood that declarations concerning its 'inconceivability' were not enough and that some more realistic and serious measures than maintaining the "balance of terror" were needed to prevent it, primarily an easing of the cold war against the USSR" (p 185).

Many of the book's pages are devoted to an examination of the foreign policy of President J. Kennedy, who "actually recognized the existence of a definite military balance between the USSR and the United States and drew from this recognition the sole realistic conclusion concerning the need for peaceful coexistence" (p 186). At the same time the author shows the contradictoriness of the United States' foreign policy at the start of the 1960's, which was conditioned by the fact that at the basis of this policy were two different trends--the moderately realistic and reactionary-aggressive, which was nurtured by that same notorious "philosophy of strength".

We would draw the reader's attention to the fact that it was precisely at the start of the 1960's that there appeared in Washington the so-called theory of the "exhaustion" of the USSR by way of an unchecked arms race, the author of which was Rand Corporation employee G. Rowan, who held the position of deputy assistant defense secretary in the J. Kennedy administration. And we have to reproach Yu. Mel'nikov here: this "theory" could have been the subject of a more detailed examination than the book makes. Particularly considering the fact that both the J. Kennedy administration and all subsequent Washington administrations--from L. Johnson through the present occupant of the White House--in fact adopted the illusory "Rowan theory".

The analysis of the basis and practice of American imperialism's postwar foreign policy culminates in the work in an outline of R. Reagan's foreign policy. The protege of particularly reactionary, chauvinist and aggressive groupings, which have invariably advocated the pursuit of foreign policy from the strictest positions of strength, American leadership and bellicose anticommunism, the 40th U.S. President has proclaimed and headed a new anti-Soviet "crusade". "We must build peace on strength. Peace will be firm only if we are strong"--he has repeatedly defined his foreign policy program in such words. The "Reagan team" has openly set the goal of achieving military, strategic superiority over the USSR (pp 325-326). It has made the basis of its provocative and most dangerous policy here all at once U.S. military doctrines developed previously--from "massive retribution" through Carter's PD59, which speaks of Washington's intention of waging a "limited, but lengthy nuclear war".

The monograph in question emphasizes that with R. Reagan's occupancy of the White House "the history, theory and practice of American strength began their new spiral in the vicious circle in accordance with the formula: the greater this strength, the more manifest its impotence, onerousness, futility and danger for America itself" (p 318).

We would note in conclusion that Yu. Mel'nikov's new work, which is imbued by the thought concerning the groundlessness in the modern historical era of the "philosophy of strength" itself as a basis of foreign policy, a thought which is proven convincingly, has undoubtedly enriched Soviet American studies. We would hope that it will be greeted with interest by the readers.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850
CSO: 1816/10

BOOK ON AFRICAN FOREIGN POLICY EDITED BY ANATOLIY GROMYKO

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6,
Jun 84 pp 148-149

[V. Kasatkin review: "African States in the Modern World"]

[Text] The foreign policy and diplomacy of the emergent African countries, which currently constitute approximately one-third of UN members, has become an increasingly pronounced and impressive factor of international life in recent years. Interest in the problems which constitute the content of the book in question,* which are as yet insufficiently studied in Soviet and foreign historiography, is therefore natural.

One of the book's undoubted merits is the vast amount of factual material which the author has collected characterizing the foreign policy and diplomacy of the Maghreb countries and the sub-Saharan African states.

The basis of the study is V.I. Lenin's conclusion concerning the existence of irreconcilable contradictions between imperialism and the oppressed peoples. The monograph corroborates on the basis of numerous examples that genuine liberation from the domination of monopoly capital, which is "capable of subordinating to itself and in reality does subordinate even states which enjoy the fullest political independence,"** demands the emphatic liquidation of all political, financial-economic and other forms of colonialism and neocolonialism.

The author shows convincingly that the emergence in the international arena of the diplomacy of emergent African countries united in the OAU was possible only thanks to the cardinal change in the correlation of forces in the world as a result of the formation and strengthening of the world socialist system. He rightly notes that developing states relying on the support of the socialist

* A.A. Shvedov, "Nezavisimaya Afrika: vnesnepoliticheskiye problemy, diplomaticeskaya bor'ba [Independent Africa: Foreign Policy Problems, Diplomatic Struggle], Under the general editorship and with a forward by Anat.A. Gromyko, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury, 1983, p 350.

** V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 27, p 379.

community can oppose the imperialist diktat perfectly well. A scientific analysis of the formation of the foreign policy of the countries of the continent is organically linked in the work with a demonstration of the important role of the USSR's peace-loving Leninist foreign policy in the rendering of assistance to the African peoples' liberation struggle.

A separate chapter is devoted to an examination of the Soviet Union's bilateral relations with African countries and its support for the struggle of the continent's peoples for true independence and social progress. As A. Shvedov cogently reveals in the example of the development of the diplomacy of a number of African states, history has fully confirmed the viability of Lenin's idea concerning the merger into a single stream of the social and liberation revolutions and the decisive significance of the ideas of socialism not only for successful struggle against colonialism but also in the process of the conversion of the policy of the young national states pursuing an independent foreign policy into a progressive factor of international relations. The conclusion concerning the gradual strengthening of the authority and influence of a progressive, anti-imperialist nucleus of the group of African countries both within a continental framework and in the nonaligned movement and the United Nations would also appear warranted (p 154). On the basis of a number of specific examples the monograph shows that it is precisely anti-imperialism and resolute opposition to all manifestations of neocolonialism which ultimately determine the specifics of these countries' diplomacy and help them act as the cementing force of the OAU.

Of undoubted interest are the data adduced in the book on the Soviet Union's cooperation with the independent states of the continent in the solution of such urgent problems of the present-day as a halt to the arms race and the defense of peace, liquidation of the vestiges of colonialism and the establishment of a world economic order which is just for all peoples. A. Shvedov emphasized that there are objective prerequisites for the expansion of such cooperation both within the United Nations and other international organizations and outside of them.

There is no doubt as to the expediency of the book's separate examination of the foreign policy of the Maghreb countries (chapter I), which have a number of specific singularities by virtue of their simultaneous membership of both the Arab world and Africa, and the sub-Saharan states (chapter II), which corresponds to the division of the countries of the continent which is generally accepted in Soviet and foreign historiography. Also perfectly justified is the fact that the work examines merely the African aspects of the foreign policy of Egypt and Sudan.

Analyzing the foreign policy of the independent African states, the author distinguishes its three main stages. Whereas in the 1960's the absolute majority of African countries which had gained their independence was characterized by, in the main, the concentration of efforts on the consolidation of the political independence which had only just been won, liquidation of the fettering treaties and agreements imposed by the former metropoles and the foreign military presence, a rebuff of attempts at direct interference in their affairs and so forth, in the 1970's the struggle of the diplomacy of states

adhering to an independent foreign policy course or endeavoring to pursue such acquired, as the monograph shows graphically, qualitatively new content. Tasks not only of the completion of decolonization but also of opposition to the financial-economic expansion of neocolonialists, securing national control over key sectors of the states' economy and natural resources and a strengthening under the influence of the general climate of international relaxation of their economic independence moved to the fore. At the same time in the 1970's the leading group of African countries began to act increasingly assertively as a force making an appreciable contribution to the solution not only of regional but also urgent international problems. And, finally, in the 1980's these states are beginning to pay particular attention to the solution of present-day global problems and are becoming an active force of the nonaligned movement.

Separate chapters of the monograph are devoted to the experience of the struggle of the developing countries' diplomacy against French and British colonialism and the expansion of American imperialism. Unfortunately, the book pays insufficient attention to a study of their mutual relations with other imperialist states, primarily the FRG, Italy, Japan and Israel, and also their relations with China. The process of the formation and strengthening of the OAU evidently merits additional study.

The value of the study undertaken by A. Shvedov is also determined by the fact that it analyzes in detail both the achievements and the complex problem being encountered by the foreign policy of the African states. Difficulties are engendered not only by objective factors, primarily neocolonialists' attempts to switch to a counteroffensive, but also by particular features of the political views of the leading figures of a number of countries and the influence of rightwing-nationalist, tribalist and conservative-religious views and concepts.

The monograph's analysis of the political crises and territorial conflicts reflected in inter-African relations, which Africa experienced in the 1960's-1970's and which are continuing in our day, is of great interest. The detailed examination of such urgent problems for Africa as the struggle for the liberation of Namibia, the Western Sahara conflict and the situation in Chad and around it is among the work's undoubted merits.

The chronology of the most important events in the countries of the continent in the period 1951-1982 and also the information concerning the dates of the Soviet Union's recognition of African states and establishment of diplomatic relations with them appended to the book serve as valuable reference material for the broad reader and the specialist.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850
CSO: 1816/10

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE OF IMPERIALISM, MONOPOLIST CONTRADICTIONS

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNNYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6,
Jun 84 pp 149-151

[R. Entov review: "Study of the Regularities of Present-Day Capitalism"]

[Excerpts] A considerable part of the book in question* is devoted to the structure of the theory of imperialism. The author highlights a most complex question--the method of inclusion of categories of imperialism in the general system of the political economy of capitalism. She notes correctly, we believe, the unsatisfactory nature of a simple "space-time division" of material, as is the case when reading a course of study, when new features typical of monopoly capitalism are simply described outside of their connection with the general regularities of the mode of production. The place of each element of this complex structure or the other is determined not by when a given phenomenon emerged (earlier or later than others) but by its content and the role which it performs in the system. For this reason it is so important at each stage of the study of new phenomena (particularly in the course of exposition of Lenin's theory of imperialism) to reveal in them the movement and development of the fundamental regularities of "capitalism in general".

The most complex question which arises upon the formation of the structure of the section "Imperialism" is determination of the place of the general crisis of capitalism and state-monopoly capitalism. Showing that the general crisis of capitalism represents the culminating point connected with the characterization of imperialism as dying capitalism, I. Rudakova distinguishes the specific content of the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism as a process of the revolutionary collapse and disintegration of bourgeois relations. Inasmuch as state-monopoly capitalism is a direct continuation and development of the basic regularities of monopoly capitalism, an examination of material pertaining to state-monopoly capitalism should precede the problem of the historical place of imperialism and, consequently, a characterization of the general crisis of capitalism.

The chapters devoted to the significance of the method of scientific abstraction and the correlation between the essence and the phenomenon in the theory of

* I.Ye. Rudakova, "Metodologicheskiye problemy teorii imperializma"
[Methodological Problems of the Theory of Imperialism], Moscow, Izdatel'stvo MGU, 1983, p 168.

imperialism are very interesting. The book adduces a cogent characterization of the phases of movement from abstract to specific and the "unfolding" of the essence of imperialism as its economic characteristics are studied. The monopoly is the starting point of this analysis. The author sees, rightly, we believe, in the capitalist monopoly and its inherent contradictions the "maximum abstraction" in the system of monopoly capitalism, noting that V.I. Lenin selected the industrial monopoly as the first form of its manifestation. The unfolding of the economic characteristics of imperialism at the same time represents the gradual development of the monopoly as a complex system of relations; such an analysis makes it possible to ascertain the essence of monopoly capitalism and the laws of its movement. The monograph shows convincingly that Lenin's theory was always aimed against vulgar-apologist interpretations of imperialism at the level of descriptions which do not go beyond the framework of outward, superficial phenomena.

The list of problems examined in chapter 4 of the book in question (which, incidentally, as chapter 7 also, is devoted to a critique of the methodological bases of bourgeois monopoly theory) makes it possible to link more closely the exposition with an examination of the various interpretations of capitalist society by contemporary bourgeois economists and sociologists. I would like to wish that the author in the course of subsequent work on the subject make a critical analysis of the new interpretations of imperialism and the monopoly being developed within the framework of the "postindustrial economic system" theory.

Continuing the research into the sphere of the theory of capitalist monopoly, I. Rudakova pays special attention to an analysis of the monopoly as a form of the development of the contradictions of capital. With the transition from free competition to the domination of the monopolies an extraordinarily important singularity in the development of the intrinsic contradiction of capitalism is discovered: the "solution" and "removal" of the initial contradiction incorporates the feature of negation of the commodity form of relations by forms of connexion in social production not adequate to capital (elements of plan conformity) (p 110). Under the new conditions the very mechanism of the functioning of the capitalist economy is undergoing appreciable changes. Studying this problem, the author approaches the question of the actions of the law of value under imperialism in an atmosphere of the undermining of commodity production.

A chapter specially devoted to this question sets out precisely the various theoretical interpretations of the effect of the law of value under the conditions of the monopolized economy. I. Rudakova offers her concept, which proceeds from the proposition concerning the undermining of the law of value by monopoly regulation. Her general approach is interesting; many contradictions, for example, the conclusion concerning the new quality of the price of production under the conditions of imperialism, would appear fruitful. Nonetheless, the purely "summary" nature of the exposition, dictated, evidently, by the length of the chapter, and also the paradoxical nature of certain formulations (it says on page 132 that the specific form of operation of the law of value under the conditions of monopoly capitalism expresses its self-negation; somewhat further on, on page 147, a "cost mechanism," which is identified with free competition,

is introduced into the examination) complicate the perception of some of the ideas expressed in the work. The general impression perhaps boils down to the fact that this chapter may be regarded as the start of an original and serious investigation of a most complex problem of the political economy of capitalism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850
CSO: 1816/10

ORIENTAL STUDIES INSTITUTE BOOK ON TNC'S IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6,
Jun 84 pp 153-154

[M. Zagrebel'nyy review: "Contradictions Intensify"]

[Text] Kiev--Contemporary Marxist economic science pays the closest attention to problems of the development of the emergent countries. As the CPSU Central Committee June (1983) Plenum emphasized, "the process occurring in them are complex and of differing significance, and it is important to understand them correctly." Bourgeois ideologists are persistently attempting to distort the essence of the young states' economic growth and to foist on them as a panacea against difficulties of economic and social development capitalist social relations. The proposition that "prosperity" is knocking at the doors open to foreign capital in the developing countries is a favorite hobbyhorse of imperialist propaganda.

The appearance of the monograph in question,* which was prepared by a group of scholars of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Oriental Studies, is highly opportune under these conditions. In fact the first study of the activity of international monopolies in the nonsocialist Southeast Asian countries in national economic literature, it simultaneously serves as a good aid in polemics on questions of the future of the young states and convincing proof of the unequal nature of the reorganization of foreign economic relations on the path of "partnership" with monopoly capital.

It is precisely the Southeast Asian states which today occupy first place in the developing world in the rate of growth of direct investments from abroad. In the first half of the book (chapters 1-3) the authors reveal mainly in the example of Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and the Philippines (the ASEAN members) the set of objective and subjective factors of the comprehensive penetration of the economy of the region's countries by international monopolies. The procapitalist economic policy of the former, the existence of huge natural resources, considerable skilled manpower resources and the relatively capacious home market are enticing private foreign capital. As the work shows,

* "Sverkhmonopolii v Yugo-Vostochnoy Azii" [Supermonopolies in Southeast Asia]. Executive editors G.I. Chufrin and G.S. Shabalina. Moscow, Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury izdatel'stva "Nauka," 1983, p 224.

the volume of foreign direct private investments in Southeast Asia had increased by a factor of 6.4 in 1977 compared with 1967 and amounted to \$13.4 billion (pp 38, 39). Foreign monopoly capital is participating increasingly here in the expansion of the sectors of subdivision I and contributing to the enclave character of the development of modern sectors of industry, increasing the disproportionality of the multistructure economy of the region. The two most important sectors of an export-raw material nature in terms of significance and amount of foreign private capital investments are oil- and tin-producing industry. An expansion of the positions of the transnational corporations (TNC) (see pp 58-61), which in recent years have also occupied the leading position in the sectors of extractive industry--the development of bauxite, copper ore, nickel, antimony and zinc deposits--may be observed here. An important area of the monopolies' expansion is their stimulation in the sphere of trade and services (p 61). The study comprehensively reveals the driving forces, forms and consequences of the cooperation in the region's countries of the TNC and the Chinese bourgeoisie. According to certain estimates, a local Chinese financial group is among the three biggest financial syndicates of the capitalist world together with the Rockefeller and Rothschild groups (pp 79-80). The entrepreneurial capital (including trade) of the ethnic Chinese in the ASEAN countries amounted to \$16.6 billion in 1975, while in the majority of states of the region their capital in domestic and foreign trade has superiority over the positions of the local indigenous bourgeoisie and foreign trade firms (p 82).

The second half of the work (chapters 4-7) contains an analysis of the influence of the international monopolies on the economic development of the region's nonsocialist countries. On the basis of a collation of a broad range of facts and statistical material the authors prove that "the most important result of TNC activity in the Southeast Asian developing countries is not so much the rendering of assistance in a rise in the overall level of development of the production forces of the host countries since, guided by their own interests, the TNC are prepared merely to a negligible extent to influence the accomplishment of this most important task, as the fact that they are objectively contributing to these countries' more active inclusion in the system of the international capitalist division of labor, which, in turn, corresponds to the strategic interests of imperialism" (p 160).

Among the monograph's undoubted merits we should put the scrupulous study of the new forms and methods of the adaptation of international capital to the changing political and economic situation in the emergent countries which have embarked on the path of capitalist development. The authors reach the important conclusion that "new disproportions are piling up" on a modern technical basis and "at the new level of development of the production forces, and a modification of the allocation of functions between the developed capitalist and the developing countries, given a simultaneous increase in the internationalization of production on a global scale, is under way" (pp 128-129).

The book contains a cogent criticism of diverse bourgeois and non-Marxist views on the economic relations of the supermonopolies and the states of the region and considerable statistical data which is new to the Soviet reader. Concise information on companies of the nonsocialist Southeast Asian countries whose activity is controlled by the biggest imperialist supermonopolies is adduced in a special appendix.

In our opinion, an analysis of the specific features of the economic relations of the Southeast Asian nonsocialist countries and the supermonopolies in the context of the emergent states' struggle for the establishment of a new international economic order could have been inserted organically in the monograph. In fact, are we not witnesses in the given instance to attempts at the practical realization--albeit partial--of the technocratic postulates of the new international economic order divorced from the developing states' general democratic, anti-imperialist demands for a reorganization of international economic relations?

The book in question will undoubtedly attract the attention not only of specialists in the sphere of the world economy but of all who are interested in the most recent history of Southeast Asia and its development prospects.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/10

JAPANESE BOOK ON JAPAN'S TECHNICAL INNOVATIONS, TRADE

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6, Jun 84 pp 155-157

[M. Vcherashnyaya book* review: "Modern Japan: From Technology Imports to Exports"]

[Excerpts] The author rightly observes that not only the "national receptivity" to new technical ideas but also such factors as the developed industrial infrastructure and a capacity for the organization of production oriented toward the mass consumer are at the basis of the postwar "Japanese miracle". The salutary impact of the reorientation of personnel and financial resources from military R&D to research for civil purposes is emphasized particularly. The work proves convincingly on the basis of vast factual material that the concentration of research in the military-space sphere under modern conditions no longer ensures a growth of the scientific-technical level in contiguous sectors which would make it possible to strengthen or even maintain technological advantages in international competition. "If we compare the attendant results from the investment of \$100 billion in military-space programs with the results of investments of the order of \$30 billion geared directly to R&D in the sphere of consumer goods, the yield of the latter is several times greater" (p 59).

Entry into the era of technological independence, M. Moritani believes, has set Japan the problem of choice of the priority directions of scientific-technical progress which correspond to the particular features of the current stage of the development of science and technology. The author's interpretation of these particular features is one of the merits of the book in question. Modern innovations are the consistent materialization of the results of R&D disseminated "in breadth," as it were, embracing in a complex increasingly new spheres of application, uniting them in a single whole and functioning on a qualitatively new technological basis. The author is entirely justified in reaching the conclusion concerning the growing significance of mass production on the basis of advanced technology, which is making it possible to reduce outlays on the manufacture per unit of high-technology product, thereby ensuring the dissemination of the results of research to adjacent and other sectors of industry. "The innovations of the 1980's do not mean the introduction of new

* M. Moritani, "Advanced Technology and the Japanese Contribution," the Nomura Securities Co., Ltd, 1983, p 176.

principles. They appear in the form of technology lowering production costs" (p 46). As proof of this conclusion, the work adduces the following example: with the development of a word processor by a number of Japanese firms the cost per unit product constituted 6.3 million yen in 1979 and 2.95 million yen in 1980, while in 1982 the Fujitsu Company succeeded in reducing the price to 750,000 yen (p 47).

The level of the country's scientific-technical development which has been reached is considerably influencing its foreign economic positions. The author believes that under the conditions of the emergence of discord and conflicts in the world capitalist economy Japanese advanced technology could serve the goals of ensuring "national security" and also contributing to an improvement in international commercial mutual relations. He proposes the use of national technology, which has in itself been a source of friction in world capitalist trade, as a guarantor of "security" by way of the broadening of international scientific-technical cooperation creating a system of interdependence (pp 64-65).

In the context of a settlement of international trade conflicts arising in connection with Japan's offensive on the world home electronics, remote equipment and automobile markets modern technology could be, as M. Moritani believes, a means of the establishment of new mutual interest in the accelerated development of science and technology. On the basis of a model which describes, so to speak, the "circulation" of technology in the world capitalist economy the author distinguishes the main stages of the internationalization of scientific-technical progress and reaches the conclusion concerning the possibility of the formation of a new international technological division of labor, where the export of commodities and trade in innovations would mutually stimulate one another. However, Japan's strategic orientation toward technology exports is encountering big difficulties in practice both along the lines of demand for Japanese new technology and also along the lines of supply thereof by Japanese companies, which prefer the more profitable commodity exports.

The researcher thoroughly analyzes the current situation in the trade in scientific-technical achievements and its structure and immediate prospects and also specific questions of organizing and supporting technology exports. The attraction of the third chapter of the book in question is its saturation with factual material pertaining to technology exports from Japan both as an independent form of foreign economic activity and as a component of the export of capital and the organization of overseas production in the context of international scientific-technical cooperation. For the purpose of easing tension the latter frequently provides for the sale of products manufactured under Japanese license under the trademark of the purchaser of these licenses.

Japan's considerable successes in the management of innovation activity, from the practical orientation of invention through the precise organization of the introduction of its results in production, are eliciting Western countries' growing interest and represent, the author believes, considerable potential in the expansion of technology exports (pp 130-131).

The developing states occupy an important place in Japan's technological expansion. It is experiencing to a growing extent here currently the consequences of the "boomerang effect," that is, increased competition on the part of purchasers of its technical novelties, primarily the new industrializing Southeast Asian countries. Nonetheless, M. Moritani believes, it is essential to continue to practice technical assistance to these countries, which are suppliers of raw material and energy resources and which represent a sphere of the relocation of the material-consuming and labor-intensive sectors of industry. For the purpose of the formation of favorable conditions for horizontal integration he recommends the more extensive use of such forms as supplies of "turnkey" plants based on "mature" technology with regard for the level of industrial culture in the host states (143-144).

In concluding the review of a work to whose author a certain absolutization of the Japanese experience is not alien let us dwell on the propositions which it contains which appear unacceptable. Primarily groundless is the proposition concerning a so-called class leveling in Japan, according to which there, as distant from the situation which exists in other countries, there is no "privileged class monopolizing the fruits of scientific-technical progress" (p 27). The practice of the class struggle in the country refutes this assertion. And, further: the author's pronouncements contained in the book concerning the priority nature of civil R&D are not corroborated in real life. Precisely, the reverse: the interest of Western countries, primarily the United States, in the use of Japanese technology for military purposes has increased considerably recently. Such technology exports could hardly contribute to an improvement in the international atmosphere, that is, the goal proclaimed by M. Moritani.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/10

DOCUMENT PUBLICATION ANNOUNCED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 6,
Jun 84 p 157

[Izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literature announcement of publication of USSR
foreign policy documents]

[Text] The USSR Foreign Ministry Commission for the Publication of Diplomatic Documents has embarked on the regular publication of Soviet foreign policy documents under the general title "Za mir i bezopasnost' narodov" [For Peace and the Peoples' Security], which cover the period from the mid-1960's. The majority of the documents have been published previously in various sources, however, concentrated in a single publication, they make it possible to illustrate the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state of the current period more comprehensively. The publication will reflect in documentary fashion the forms and methods of implementation of the Leninist foreign policy.

For the purpose of the all-embracing illustration of foreign policy problems each volume of the publication will include an annotated list of the documents supplementing it with an indication of the sources in which they are published.

The volume for 1966 in two books has been published.

The publication is aimed at broad circles of readers interested in problems of the foreign policy of the USSR and international relations.

An advance order for the periodic volumes may be placed in bookstores handling sociopolitical literature.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1984.

8850

CSO: 1816/10

- END -